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English Abstract

This research aims at evaluating the level of creativity in textbooks content design. Thus, the research is an attempt to answer the major questions: To which extent content design of the Palestinian EFL textbooks for grades (4th-6th) is creative? And to which extent there is potential in these textbooks to contribute to fostering creativity in students in the Palestinian middle primary stage (4-6 grades) from teachers' viewpoint?

The study uses the qualitative methodology with a triangular data collection approach to answer the research questions. Content analysis technique is used for evaluation of the text sample by using a prepared evaluation scale. This scale is a research-oriented one that is developed and refereed to suffice for the evaluation of the text. Descriptive statistic is used to describe and analyze the triangulated data collected from the three sources (i.e. the researcher, the teachers and an EFL expert).

A stratified sample from the targeted textbooks is drawn to cover 24 units. The sample constitutes 9 units, 3 units from each textbook. A convenient sample of seven teachers and two supervisors is chosen to apply the in-depth interview of their view of the texts.

The creativity levels in textbooks of the 4th and 5th grades are found to fail at levels of (46.5% & 50.4%) respectively. Whereas, it is found that the 6th grade textbook's creativity level passes with (60.3%). Moreover, there seems to be a low contribution of text-evaluation activities in promoting learners' original thinking and synthesizing abilities. All sample texts (4th, 5th & 6th grades) failed the creativity level concerning originality by achieving low scores namely; 37.4%, 37.6% and 52.2% respectively. While, it is found that the contribution of the text-comprehension sample was higher than that of text-evaluation activities. Samples of (4th, 5th & 6th grades) scored 49%, 55.4% and 61.8%, respectively. Nevertheless, flexibility and fluency as a measure of creativity in all text samples is found to be low on average (i.e. 47.6%). Motivation in all text samples scored low on average (55.56%).
Teachers' views are mostly in agreement with findings of the content analysis based on the creativity scale.

Recommendations are given to improve the creativity in text design at levels of comprehension passages and evaluation activities. Recommendations are presented to policy makers, researchers and teachers for improving the efficacy of the text design by becoming more creative.
منخفض الدراسة

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى تقدير مستوى الإبداع في تصميم محتوى التفاعلي للغة الإنجليزية في الصفوف من الابتدائية حتى الاعدادية. يتطلب تصميم محتوى التفاعلي للغة الإنجليزية للاجتماع على الأسئلة الرئيسية التالية: إلى أي مدى يعتبر تصميم محتوى الكتب المدرسية المقررة للغة الإنجليزية للصفوف (4-6) إبداعياً وفقاً لمقياس التصميم المبدع؟ وإلى أي مدى يعتبر معلم اللغة الإنجليزية تصميم محتوى الكتب المقررة لهذه المادة في الصفوف من الابتدائية حتى الاعدادية؟

وتوظف الدراسة منهجية البحث الكيفي مع استخدام مصادر متعددة في جميع المعلومات (triangulation). وتستخدم منهجية تحليل المحتوى في تقييم عينة الكتب من خلال أداء قياس لمستوى الإبداع في تصميم المحتوى. وقد تم تطوير هذه الدراسة بناءً على البحث والأدبيات السابقة، وتلقيحه لنائب معايير تقييم الكتب المقررة. استخدمت الطرق الإحصائية الوصفية لتحليل البيانات التي تم جمعها من مصادر ثلاثية (تحليل الباحث، ومحلل خبير، ومعلم اللغة الإنجليزية).

يتمثل مجتمع الدراسة بثلاثة كتب مقررة للغة الإنجليزية للصفوف الرابع والخامس والسادس، تحتوي على 24 وحدة دراسة. أما عينة الدراسة فقد احتوت على 9 وحدات، ثلاثة منها من كل كتاب مقرر. كما تم اختيار عينة من 7 معلم للغة الإنجليزية ومشرفين تربويين لتطبيق المقابلات حول نظرة لتمديد الإبداع في تصميم الكتب المقررة.

وقد وجدت الدراسة أن الكتب المقررة للغة الإنجليزية للصفوف الرابع والخامس والسادس قد فشلت في تحقيق مستوى الإبداع في تصميم المحتوى، حيث حقق الكتاب المقرر (46.5% و 50.4%) على التوالي. في حين وجدت الدراسة أن الكتاب المقرر للصف السادس قد نجح في تحقيق مستوى الإبداع في تصميم المحتوى بنسبة (60.3%) بصرف النظر، فذك الدراسة أن هناك مساهمة قليلة لنشاطات التقييم في الكتب المقررة. في تحقيق الأصول في التفكير، حيث فشلت الوحدات المتاحة من الكتب المقررة للصفوف الرابع والخامس والسادس في هذا الجانب وحققت نسب 37.4%، 37.6%، 52.2% على التوالي. أما مساهمة قراءات الفهم والاستيعاب في هذا الجانب فقد حققت نسب 61.8%، 54.5%، 55.4% على التوالي. كما أظهر النتائج ضعف في مساهمة الكتاب المقرر في تطوير التفكير المرن والطلق، حيث كان مستوى لعلم الكتاب الثلاثة هو 47.6%. بالإضافة إلى ذلك كانت مساهمة الكتاب المقرر في تطوير دافعية المتعلمين ضعيفة أيضاً (55.6%). كما أظهرت نتائج المقابلات مع المعلمين متوافقة مع هذه النتائج المبنية على أداء قياس مستوى الإبداع في تصميم محتوى الكتب المقررة.

اختتمت الدراسة بعدم التوصيات من أجل زيادة مستوى الإبداع في نصوص الفهم والاستيعاب وكذلك نشاطات التقييم التابعة لها. وتقدم الدراسة توصيات لسياسات التربوية والباحثين التربويين. 
ومعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية بهدف تحسين مستوى الإبداع في تصميم الكتب المقرر لتحفيز المتعلمين على تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية بشكل إبداعي.
Chapter One

Introduction

This study aims to explore the level of creativity in content design of the English Textbooks used in the public Palestinian schools for grades four to six. It aims, as well, to investigate whether these textbooks' content design has the potential to motivate the learner to learn creatively? It is needless to say that education does not function in a vacuum. Education has tools, materials, and directions, methods of teaching and learning, and products. It is both content and process.

For me as a researcher the interest is to research the educational materials and their contribution in the learning process. Sternberg and Williams (2009) argue that educators must pursue, in their teaching, an approach that utilizes all learning opportunities available to develop students’ creative abilities. Therefore, all materials, activities, methods and techniques should serve the aim of developing those abilities.

In the Palestinian context it is observed that, most of the time the textbook is considered the main reference and resource for learners (Dajani, 2009). It is important, therefore, to ensure that the textbook propels higher mental abilities and skills needed to develop and educate learners to be the desirable product of Palestinian education. These texts should have a creative content design (Iskasen & Parnes, 1985; & Torrance & Goff, 2009). According to Sternberg and Williams, among the abilities that should be enhanced by teaching are: (a) synthetic ability which means creating novel ideas and connections between things;(b) analytical
ability which means ability to evaluate ideas and situations; and (c) the practical ability where individuals are expected to utilize the previous two abilities and skills in improving the environment and transforming abstract ideas to real practice. However, the authors point out traditional approaches to teaching that may block creative thinking and problem solving. Such approaches develop the fixated student–teacher roles of “learned helplessness”.

Power (2009) identified a teaching problem in a misconception of teachers for what is meant by text. Teachers according to him seem to treat the text of any given comprehensive passage as a tool of teaching grammar, vocabulary, structure or anything that relates to language as such, rather than teaching the text as a source of motivation for the learner to learn on his/ her own. The text should be treated as a tool of inspiring the learner to use it in his/ her daily life affairs. Application of the language is what counts. This problem is relevant to this study in the sense that the text might not be the source of lacking instructional material but rather, teachers’ misconception of the text. Is it possible to create a text that encourages teachers and learners to acquire the language in a creative way that would enable them to use the language meaningfully in their own life? Along the same line, Muaka, Bernhardt, and Kamil (2003) state that, the aim of reading is to understand the texts, and to be able to learn from them. Reading, according to them, is a skill that can empower individuals to learn. Thus, they argue that good teaching is the one that enables students to learn to read and read to learn.
Communicative language learning, which is represented in enhanced literacy levels, is one of the important learning needs for children. Therefore, one of the functions a primary school curriculum of a foreign language should accomplish is influencing literacy skills. Development of these skills will provide a basis for further language learning in advanced school levels. Hayes and Schrier argue that most of reviewed foreign language curricula ignore social contexts and focus on linguistic and structural aspects of language, preventing consequently many precious opportunities to better language learning. Thus, new approaches to teaching foreign or second language tend to focus on helping learners in acquiring meaningful communicative abilities. This can’t be achieved without developing a curriculum including textbook that respond to the communicative language learning approach (Hayes & Schrier, 2000).

I adopt Guilford's concept of creativity. Creativity is a twofold concept that relates to mental abilities and its products. A creative mental ability has to be capable of processing information in a divergent and convergent manner, interactively. It is like moving from general to particular (deduction) and from particular to general (induction). This means that in being at the general level you are converging, and in being at the particular level you are diverging. As language is one of the main cultural and intellectual tools for human beings, it is important to consider the ability of school language textbooks to develop this tool as to serve the empowerment of divergent and creative thinking, and thus, creative learning of language itself (Amabile, 1996). This type of thinking can be developed through dimensions of the
curriculum including the human dimension (student –teacher), the knowledge dimension (textbooks and teaching materials) and the time- space dimension (the classroom and the educational environment inside and outside class room) (MacKinnon, 1965). Focusing on language textbook evaluation, it is important to investigate the textbook’s contribution to the enhancement of learners’ divergent thinking through intention to build the basic skills, to build self management and meta-cognitive skills, and to reward curiosity, discovery, and risk taking.

**Problem of Investigation**

This study aims at evaluating the level of creativity in textbooks’ content design. The evaluation will cover texts of 4th to 6th grades. Thus the problem is (Evaluation of Palestinian 4th-6th Grades' EFL Textbooks and their content creativity level). The study focuses on measuring the creativity in text design of both, the comprehension passages and evaluation activities by the end of each passage.

**Key Concepts**

**Textbooks:** the textbooks taught in the middle cycle (4th grade - 6th grades) in the Palestinian schools, including student books (comprehension reading, discussion, and following evaluation questions) and workbooks (comprehension exercises).

**Creative foreign language textbook design:** It is the design of English as a foreign language textbooks as measured by Miekley (2005), within a framework of Creative Problem Solving design as measured by Iskasen and Parnes (1985) and Torrance and
Goff (2009), and in terms of Guilford’s’ notion of divergent production (1987), (See appendix 1, p. 129 for the scale).

**Creative learning**: abilities to learn within forms of divergent-convergent production as defined by Guilford (1987), approaching solutions to the one problem through the application of forms of flexibility, fluency and originality.

**Rationale for the Investigation**

Cognitive and social constructivists believe that language textbooks should consider factors that affect learners’ abilities in conceptualizing and recognizing concepts and things. It should be though challenging to those abilities in a balanced way. Content has to be developed contextually within two directional goals; students abilities and students lifetime problems (Stokes, 2001).

In fact, findings of research on evaluating Palestinian textbooks (Bitar & Assali, 2008; Breika, 2008; & Mohammad, 2007; Fattash, 2010) indicate low achievement scores of Palestinian students in learning any of the subject matters due to weak textbook design. Similar conclusions could be drawn from results of research study on students' ability to acquire the English language. Fattash (2010) in assessing teachers' beliefs on students' achievement found that; students' achievement in learning grammar is higher than their achievement in acquiring strategies for learning and developing their language acquisition.
Torrance and Goff (2009) argue that children tend to learn more effectively by creative methods of teaching than by authoritarian teaching strategies. Accordingly, curriculum itself must provide opportunities for creative learning. These opportunities include materials that invite original work or self-initiated projects, as well as motivation to practice lifelong learning. This type of learning is related to acquisition of problem solving skills. These cognitive skills enable learners to encounter future unexpected problems and to be more effective in handling these problems accordingly. Hence, education and instruction systems, including design of textbooks, must focus on developing modes of thinking where problem solving can be enhanced.

The communicative language learning approach enables learners to use divergent and convergent thinking effectively in problem solving (Hayes & Schrier, 2000). This shows that such approach is a relevant approach to lifelong learning. Nevertheless, it is worth mentioning here that the Palestinian textbooks of English as foreign language seem to lack the sufficient level of the needed ability for such purpose. This conclusion is seen clearly in Fattash (2010) which shows that very few aspects in English textbooks' design reflect the use of the communicative approach as viewed by teachers.

**Significance of Investigation**

Curriculum development is considered of high importance for the MOEHE. Reform is seen as a possible outcome to the partnership of decision makers and researchers (PNA: Ministry of Education and Higher Education, 2008). I believe that
the study of English textbooks' creativity level is highly relevant to the Palestinian education reform plan.

The research under study is an example of partnership between researchers and teachers. Researchers, in addition to teachers themselves, are capable of providing significant and deep insights to the experience of curriculum development, where qualitative and quantitative content analysis, formal assessment, action research and other types and methodologies can be useful. Particularly, there is a need to reflect on the design of textbooks, their content and organization, in order to examine their ability to provoke creative learning of English as a foreign language. The study may assist in providing further insights into the development of second language textbooks.

On the other hand, this study provides, through the reviewed literature and educational theory, a rationale for creative learning. Creative learning is justified in light of its relation to lifelong learning related to human development and socio-economic needs. Thus, assessment of English textbooks prepared for teaching English as a foreign language conform to the modern trends in viewing educational reform as a capital transcribed in human and socio-economic development.

In addition, this study provides a model of content analysis scale for EFL textbooks. The scale is applied in this study on English textbooks for grades (4th-6th) only. Educational researchers can adopt this scale for further evaluations of other school grades’ EFL textbooks. This is especially the case because the scale is
developed on the bases of most relevant modern studies in creative text design (see appendix 2, 136). A cited scale of this caliber might be very significant for its adaptation and adoption in evaluating other textbooks scientifically. Hopefully, this suffices to a modest contribution to knowledge in the area of textbook design.

A practical significance lies in the possibility of contributing to the enhancement of teaching English as a foreign language creatively. Hence, it is hoped that teachers and curriculum designers would benefit from this research findings along the line of creative textbooks and their characteristics relevant to their respected needs. Generally, the significance of this study lies in its contribution to research-informed curriculum development, providing tools for textbook evaluation with regards to creativity and problem solving, and its contribution to the area of creative textbook design in educational literature.

**Research questions**

This research is an attempt to answer the two major questions: To which extent is content design of the Palestinian EFL textbooks for grades (4th-6th) creative? And to which extent is there a potential in these textbook design to contribute to the fostering of creativity in students in the Palestinian middle primary stage (4-6 grades) from teachers' viewpoint?

The research questions are as follows:
1. To which extent are textbooks (instructional material) of EFL for grades (4<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup>) creative in their content design as measured by the creativity scale from the raters viewpoint?

   A. To which extent are the instructional materials in comprehension passages designed creatively?

   B. To which extent are the instructional materials in evaluation sections designed creatively?

   C. Does the content of instructional materials motivate students to learn EFL creatively at the level of comprehension passages?

   D. Does the content of instructional materials motivate students to learn EFL creatively at the level of evaluation activities?

2. To which extent are the textbooks of EFL for grades (4<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup>) creative from the teachers' viewpoint?

Limitations of the study

1. Creative textbook and creative learning as used in this study are limited to the concepts used in the developed scale (Guilford, 1987; Isaksen and Parnes, 1985; Miekle, (2005); & Torrance & Goff, 2009).

2. Results are limited to the English language textbooks taught in grades (4-6) in the Palestinian public schools for year 2010-2011, and only to the content of the comprehension and the related questions for lesson evaluation level.
3. Results are limited to the tools and content analyses developed in this study.

Methodology

In this study, I use a qualitative methodology. Triangulation is used in acquiring the needed data. Thus, three sources of data are used; relational content analysis of textbooks used by the researcher and one TEFL expert, relational content analysis by a focus group of teachers and in-depth interviews with teachers. The population includes all English language textbooks of (4th – 6th grades) used in the Palestinian public schools; and English teachers and supervisors for grades (4-6) in the elementary schools of the Directorate of Ramallah and Al-Bireh. A creativity scale is developed in light of literature review. Descriptive statistics are used to present the frequency of contents that has potential to motivate creative learning in each comprehension section and to test the significance of the results of content analyses within scale measures, and the interviewees' views as clustered in themes that are seen by the qualitative analyses for yielded views.
Chapter Two

Literature Review

This chapter is divided into two sections. The first section on conceptual framework presents the literature reviewed on educational theory related to creativity and learning, curriculum design, textbook design and standards of good language textbooks. The major concepts and principles of this conceptual framework are used in developing the creativity scale used in this study as seen in all its forms (content analysis matrix and in-depth interview form). The conceptual framework provides as well a rationale for creative learning in light of the notions of lifelong learning and communicative approaches. The second section on previous studies presents studies that investigate the relationship between learning and creativity, textbook's role in learning and its contribution to the enhancement of thinking abilities and language skills. It introduces previous studies' findings on language learning motivation and creativity. In addition, it reviews previous studies that address school textbook evaluation by content analysis.

Conceptual framework

This section presents a framework of theories that constitute a basis of creative language learning within communicative approaches that promote a lifelong learning philosophy; a philosophy that advocates self-independency in learning rather than self-helplessness. Thus, concepts addressed below are: creativity and its sources;
creativity as a product of divergent and convergent thinking, creativity in learning, development of language and thought, the relation between school learning and cognitive development, and communicative approaches to language learning.

Creativity has been viewed within two dimensions: creativity as a cognitive process and creativity as a personal approach (Karkockiene, 2005). In studying human development and learning styles, these dimensions are integrated. In order to develop creativity in learners, resources for creativity as a process must be identified and combined to the personal characteristics. This is a holistic perception of creativity that doesn’t only consider knowledge and skills of individuals. Creativity theorists (Karkockiene, 2005; & Guilford, 1978) state that knowledge and skills are not enough sources for creativity. Creativity accordingly, requires ability to use the learning context effectively, ability to generate, evaluate, and execute ideas. It depends on learners' thinking styles as well as their motivation. However, these are not the only sources for creativity. Personal characteristics such as persistence and determination, and environmental context are significant factors as well (Barlow, 2000; & Karkockiene, 2005).

Thus, there are two sets of sources for creativity; namely cognitive sources and personality ones. The cognitive sources represent the mental component of creativity. This includes divergent thinking elements such as problem sensitivity, fluency, flexibility and originality; in addition to the general knowledge and specific knowledge that have to diverge and converge in forms of broad perception, logical
thinking, analyzing and synthesizing, thinking, and memory (Barlow, 2000; Karkockiene, 2005; & Guilford, 1987).

The other component of creativity is personality. Sources of this component include: motives, curiosity, self-actualization, communication, and devotion, in addition to perseverance, concentration; and tolerance to ambiguity, risk taking, openness for experience, adaptation and resistance, and humor (Mumford, 2001; Richards, 2001; & Torrance & Goff, 2009).

Creativity could be viewed as a system that has input, through put and output. It is a holistic approach that related to the framework of a comprehensive relationship between three educational components: sources, process and product (MacKinnon, 1965). In context of creativity, these educational components are reflected in Guilford's Structure of the Intellect Model in its three components (contents, operations and products). It is important also to explore the notion of divergent thinking as the main element of cognitive sources for creativity, and to explore the personal sources as well.

I adopt Guilford's concept of creativity. Creativity is a twofold concept that relates to mental abilities and its products. A creative mental ability has to be capable of processing information in a divergent and convergent manner, interactively. It is like moving from general to particular (deduction) and from particular to general (induction). Where in being at the general level you are converging, while, in being in the particular level you are diverging.
Creativity as described by Guilford seems to be a three dimensional entity; namely content, operation and product. This entity could be the ability itself, the process by which the ability is expressed, and/ or any piece of knowledge (like text). Thus, the individual ability to learn creatively has to have a creative input (for example the text) and has to go through creative producers (creative thinking and learning) and moreover, has to produce a creative product; namely language acquisition. If these three dimensions of such entity (i.e. the creative ability) are...
clearly related as described, such ability then; could be considered as a creative ability. The entity that represents the unit study in this research is the textbook. It has three dimensions; namely content dimension as viewed in comprehension passages and evaluation section in each unit as will as exercises in the workbook. The operation is the design by which this text is presented. The product is the text itself in its final form.

In reviewing Guilford (1987), it is seen that there are 120 multiple abilities in the human mind. These abilities are presented by a three-dimensional cube: a). content (four aspects), b) operations (five) and, c). products (six). Consequently, the interaction among these three dimensions shows the notion of divergent thinking in which individuals consider multiple possibilities in their attempts to solve life problems (a style for lifelong learning).

In his Structure of the Intellect model, Guilford shows the four content categories: figural, semantic, symbolic, and behavioral. Where figural content is related to direct perceptions and thoughts generated from the sense of organs and visible or audible inputs, semantic is related to imageless thoughts or thoughts of inputs that are not tangible. On the other hand, symbolic content is related to information items presented in signs or labels such as numbers or letters. Symbolic content is connected to language and communication between people, as well. The last content category, behavioral, is related to thoughts that can be predicted by cues obtained from individual’s behavior, body language, and social communication (p. 45).
Operations include: evaluation, conversion, diversion, memory and cognition. Simply, cognition means knowing; memory means putting the recognized information into storage. Divergent production involves getting out information from storage in a shape of broad search. In such search assumes a number of logical solution alternatives. Convergent production means more limited search for a desired answer. And the last operation is evaluation of the selected solution (p, 48).

The product dimension has six categories: units, classes, implications, relations, systems, and transformations. The unit is the smallest product from which all other products can be formed. Similar units become classes, units with logical causal relation form implications, two units that have connections form relations, more than two units that have connections form systems, and units that are changed through redefinition or substitution for example form transformations (p. 47). Creativity is mostly related to the transformational type of products and to the divergent and convergent operations. One important aspect in the Structure of the Intellect model is the guessing approach “divergent production on the way to convergent production” (p. 48) Then, there is a strong focus on the various skills related to transformations and the mix of divergent-convergent thinking, which would support the idea of focusing some attention upon the ability to shift in thinking and acceptance of several alternatives of problem solutions. Such skills constitute a vital part of creativity (Barlow, 2000; & Mumford, 2001).
Divergent operations mean approaching solutions to the one problem through the application of forms of flexibility, fluency, originality and elaboration. Richards (2001) provides a very simple and straightforward description of each of these terms: flexibility (different ways), fluency (more ways), originality (unusual ways) and elaboration (thoughtful ways). Mumford (2001) divides these forms into two cycle capacities (early cycle capacities and late cycle capacities). The first one includes flexibility, fluency and originality. Flexibility is the capacity to come up with and switch among different ideas or approaches, while fluency is the capacity of generating a maximum number of ideas or approaches in a given time, and originality is the capacity to generate uncommon and unusual ways of thought on problems. These early cycle capacities, according to Mumford, are connected to ideas generation. But the other important aspect in creativity is using the generated creative ideas in creative acts and productions. The late cycle capacities are entitled to that aspect. Elaboration is the broad characteristic here. It includes evaluation of ideas, planning for implementation, and monitoring of the actions’ success. Then, divergent thinking is the distinct capacity to generate multiple alternative solutions to problems as opposed to the one correct solution. Therefore, development of divergent thinking abilities in learners contributes to the development of their own creative abilities and to their original ideas (Karkockiene, 2005).

As mentioned earlier, one can say that creativity is the result of interaction between divergent and convergent operations. Explanations of Guilford's model show that intelligence of human beings is not dependent only on the diverging aspect of the
thinking process. In fact this aspect alone is not enough to produce creativity. Divergent operations are called analogical reasoning because they consider multiple possibilities. However, the analogical reasoning is not the purpose of the thinking process; solving problems is the purpose. Then, divergence by its own is not creativity; it is the interaction between divergence and convergence in the thinking process that produces creativity (Mumford, 2001).

Creativity can be optimized among individuals and societies. This happens when divergent and convergent types of production are in balance. Stokes (2001) argues that the significance of promoting divergent thinking lies in the great potential and advantages it fosters in individuals or societies. Richards (2001) states that Guilford’s divergent production not only consists of multiple cognitive processes and mind states, (such as abstraction and unconscious processes), but also it is linked to human experiences within a larger social context. The world is experiencing now a continuous change that highlights the idea of humans as open systems. These systems need to be inventive and adaptive to this change. Divergent production, according to Richards (2001), is the type of thinking needed to assure inventiveness and adaptive abilities.

Creativity and Lifelong learning

Looking for new prospects in human lives, Richards (2001) suggests that we need creativity in culture, schools and institutions in order to change the linear communication modes in life. She calls for a new learner who can utilize creativity in
daily life, where more barriers that restrict people can be broken. Therefore, Richards provides a number of characteristics of the perceived new learner including: having conscious awareness, risk taking, having greater self-acceptance, greater meaning, and connection with others.

Ecclestone (1999) argues that learning is needed to build human and social capitals. Learning must help to prevent people from being marginalized or excluded. There must be commitment to a social cohesion. Therefore, learning should link between individual’s skills and motivation and economic survival and social cohesion through ideas of human capital and social capital. The author states that the type of learning that can achieve this is lifelong learning. The notion of human capital, as Ecclestone argues, motivates learners to develop their skills and solve their communication problems.

Lifelong learning is an established relation between the individual’s learning and experience. Ecclestone argues that learning is not an isolated notion in human life; it is rather very connected to human growth and development in social and economic contexts. The author focuses in this article more on the economic context, where he argues that the really important factor that invites us to adopt a policy of lifelong learning is the current economic context which is very much far from what is desired by people, (Strain, 1998). Lifelong learning, according to Stain, can provide opportunities for actual links between learning processes and every-day social conduct, especially in the area of economy. Strain points out another important aspect
related to lifelong learning, which is: the improved skills in communication. Learning is not a matter of gaining information; it is a need to fulfill life requirements whether individual, social or economic. In a long analysis of labor market, Strain argues that the current situation and the perceived future require from the education system to produce a learner who is adaptive to the changing nature of life and who has a level of innovative abilities that help him/her in coping with and contributing to the change in life. For Hayes and Schrier (2000), and within the language learning context, this kind of learner can be produced through communicative language learning.

If the ultimate aim of educational systems was producing lifelong learners, those learners must learn how to be creative. They will always encounter new problems to be solved. Creative learning is a strategy for the future learning not only for the present. However, it is difficult for learners to adopt innovative practices, if the educational system doesn’t adopt supporting materials and other learning media. In light of the literature review (Alenso-Geta, 2008; Wells, 1999; Sternberg & Williams, 1999; Torrance & Goff, 2009), among the factors that prevent materials from being supportive is the dependence on memorized items of information, and dealing with texts merely as sources for those items. Adopting a creative system of education has implications on learners, teachers and the process itself; design of textbooks is definitely a significant part of the process (Sosniak & Stodolsky, 1993; & Wells, 1999)
Then, a learner with abilities to lifelong learning is desired, and lifelong learner must have innovative and creative abilities, which can be (in terms of language learning) developed by communicative language learning. Iskasen and Parnes (1985) argue that creative abilities are important as they enable learners to be more effective in absence of teachers, to solve future unexpected problems, promote better life conditions. All these are characteristics of what lifelong learning should be about. Some authors such as Guilford and Torrance believe these characteristics are part of the divergent production.

**Development of Language and Thought**

According to social constructivist theory cognitive development takes place on two consecutive levels, social interaction and individual internal processes. Vygotsky (1978) states "every function in the child's cultural development appears twice: first, on the social level, and later, on the individual level; first, between people and then inside the child. This applies equally to voluntary attention, to logical memory, and to the formation of concepts." (p, 57). A child first seems to use language for superficial social interaction, but at some point this language goes underground to become the structure of the child's thinking, this structure is called internal speech (Ballantyne, 2008; Schütz, 2004; & Vygotsky, 1978).

Language, then, is a crucial tool in the process of cognitive development. Advanced modes of thought are transmitted to the child by language. Thus, its development is an indicator of how the child learns how to think (Vygotsky, 1934).
However, language acquisition as a means of communication and as a tool of thought is not merely an individual process; it is not merely a social process either. Vygotsky introduces a third notion; the social historical process of language and thought development. Historical here is related to two aspects: First, it is a historical collective development process of special cultural symbols and communication tools, such as idioms, proverbs, beliefs, traditions and values; development cannot be separated from its social and cultural context. The history of the society in which a child is reared, and the child's personal history are crucial determinants of the way in which that individual will think. This fact is the result of cognitive skills and patterns of thinking. These patterns of thinking are the products of the activities practiced in the social institutions of the culture in which the individual grows up (Schütz, 2004; & Verenikina, 1999). This shows that language acquisition is contextually developed. The idea here is that we can only understand mental processes if we understand the social interaction and tools and signs that mediate them.

Constructive historical social interaction processes lead to language and thought development in individuals, eventually achieving internalization of both. Language is initially a means of communication between the child and the people in his environment. But then it functions to organize the child's thought. Communication produces the need for checking and confirming thoughts. This process is a characteristic of adult thought. Thus, the internal speech and reflective thought are produced from the interactions between the child and persons in his environment. These interactions provide the source of development of intrinsic language
development in the mental abilities of children (Ballantyne, 2008; Schütz, 2004; & Vygotsky, 1934). Thus, there is an essential interchange between thought and speech in terms of providing a development source to one another. Nevertheless, Schutz (2004) points out that language is essential in forming thought and determining personality features. However, creativity remains to be the overriding concern for the development of both thought and language.

**Creativity as Related to Development and Learning**

Ballantyne (2008), states that it is an established fact that learning should be matched in some manner with the child's developmental level. The role of learning is to provoke internal developmental processes that are able to operate only when the child is interacting with people in his environment and in cooperation with his peers. Once these processes are internalized (Vygotsky, 1934), they become part of the child's independent developmental achievements. Although learning is directly related to the course of child development, the two are never accomplished in equal measures. The relation between development and school learning is not a mere relation of sequence. There are complex dynamic relations between developmental and learning processes, and these relations result in "zones of proximal development" (ZPD) as viewed by Vygotsky. For example, the initial mastery of word meanings provides the basis for the subsequent development of a variety of highly complex internal processes in children's thinking, as mentioned before. Accordingly, Vygotsky's theory of social interaction links between development and education.
According to Vygotsky, the most important part of children's psychological development is acquisition of the culture to which they belong. Any higher mental function necessarily goes through an external social stage in its development before becoming an internal, truly mental function. Thus, the function is initially social and cultural. Hence, school learning processes can't be isolated from cultural contexts. Building individual personality is also one aspect of development within a cultural and social context, as mentioned before. Even though it is an internal process, it is first shaped and framed by social experiences, then crystallized in individuals. The implication of this is that initiative and self-determination of the child as a learner should not be hindered by educational instruction. On the contrary, instructional strategies in teaching should focus on maturing psychological functions, rather than already existing functions. These maturing functions are relevant for the general intellectual development to the next age period (Chaiklin, 2002; Verenikina, 1999; & Vygotsky, 1934).

**Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD)**

Creativity (especially Guilford's notion of divergent thinking) has been also connected to the Intelligence Quotient. However, the Structure of the Intellect Model provides a larger and more elaborate view of thinking mechanisms and the way human beings learn. In fact, the theorists of Barlow, 2000, Chaiklin, 2002; & Wells, 1999, link creativity with the notion of zone of proximal development. These theories argue that the size of the zone of proximal development is more predictive than IQ.
That is, a child with more maturing functions has comparable intellectual development, regardless of IQ. Before that, people were assuming that creativity was a natural result of intelligence as measured by IQ. Then, it is worth investigating, the relation between creativity and Vygotsky’s (1934) concept of the zone of proximal development in language acquisition.

Zone of proximal development refers to the distance between the actual developmental level and potential development level. The first is determined by independent problem solving, while the second is determined by the level of problem solving functions under the guidance of adults and/or in collaboration with more capable peers. Vygotsky (1934, p. 209) states; “We assist each child through demonstration, leading questions, and by introducing elements of the task’s solution”. Thus, maximization of the zone of proximal development depends on full social interaction. Vygotsky argues that there are no systematic principles, methods or techniques that should guide how maximization should be conducted by the teacher, peer or any other care taker. Thus, ZPD is any effective social interaction.

Then, the zone of proximal development according to this social constructivist theory is an example of what the relation between learning and development is. It is associated with collaborative interventions, be it from older expert or from peers. The purpose of these interventions is to provoke maturing psychological functions that can't be evident on their own (Chaiklin, 2002). It is not that only those things that children can do on their own which are indicative of mental abilities. What children
can do with the assistance of others might be in some sense even more indicative of their mental development than what they can do alone (Ballantyne, 2008). This implies that there are two levels of development in the learner; the actual one where mental functions are already active because of the completed cognitive developments, and a potential development level where mental abilities can be developed with external assistance (Ballantyne, 2008; & Verenikina, 1999).

Thus, the notion of a zone of proximal development (ZPD) enables one to predict the features of good learning. It is the learning which precedes development (Ballantyne, 2008). As mentioned above, however, social interaction plays an essential role in the development of cognition. And there is an emphasis on teacher-learner and learner peers collaboration and negotiation. Therefore, good learning is strongly related to social mediation of learning as well as internalization and the active position of the child in learning.

Social interaction, especially in the learning process, should include means by which the educator reaches and meets the level of the child's understanding and then leads the child from there to a higher, culturally mediated level of development. This leads to the idea of tool mediation, that is, to a consideration of what cultural tools have been provided for the child to appropriate and use on their own in their independent performance (Verenikina, 1999). Language is one of the most important cultural and intellectual tools that mediate learning and interaction.
Communicative Language Approach and Creativity

Individuals don’t learn in isolation of the social context they live in. They are born in an environment, that is shaped by the activities of previous generations (Vygotsky, 1934). It’s not only the current social context; it is the social history that affects the way people learn. Language is the strongest example of social history. In fact, it is perceived as a cultural tool that develops from communication tool to a thinking device that has its cultural basis. Language is a cultural tool that is used by individuals to make sense of, and create practical solutions to, the social problems (Vygotsky, 1934; & Wells, 1999).

Communicative language learning approach is one of the important learning conditions for children. Therefore, one of the functions primary school curriculum of foreign language should accomplish is to influence literacy skills. Development of these skills will provide a basis for further language learning in advanced school levels. Hayes and Schrier (2000) argue that most of reviewed foreign language curricula ignore social contexts and focus on linguistic and structural aspects of language, preventing consequently many precious opportunities for effective language learning. Thus, communicative approach to teach a foreign language tends to emphasize the significance of using contextual conditions as means of language acquisition. This can’t be achieved without developing a curriculum including textbook that respond to communicative language approach (Hayes & Schrier, 2000).
Power (2009) identified a teaching problem in a misconception of teachers for what is meant by text. Teachers according to him seem to treat the text of any given comprehensive passage as a tool of teaching grammar, vocabulary, structure or anything that relates to language as such, rather than teaching the text as a source of motivating the learner to learn on his own. The text should be treated as a tool of inspiring the learner to use it in his daily life affaires. Application of the language is what counts. This problem is relevant to this study in the sense that the text might not be the source of lacking instructional material but, it is rather, teachers’ misconception of the text. Is it possible to create a text that invites teachers and learners to acquire the language in a creative way that would enable them to use the language meaningfully in their own life? Along the same line, Muaka, Bernhardt, and Kamil (2003) and Long (1983) state that, the aim of reading is to understand the texts, and to be able to learn from them. Reading, according to them, is a skill that can empower individuals to learn through developing their thinking strategies. Thus, they argue that good teaching is the one that enables students to learn to read and read to learn.

Reading is considered a complex cognitive and social process. Researchers have noted that second language (L2) readers’ knowledge of linguistic features, formal conventions, and rhetorical structures may interact with their prior knowledge of the world, and of cultural as well as social establishments (Lee, 2009). However, for second language learners, both in daily life and in educational contexts, it is not common to encounter situations where they are asked to take a stance about issues
they read about. Sometimes, on a controversial text, the writer's position could be the opposite of the reader's stand, which provokes a dialogue between the reader and the text content. In this situation, the congruence between the position stated in the text and readers’ personal position that stems from their prior beliefs on that topic would affect reading performance. Therefore, research has focused on this contradiction and whether it would facilitate or hinder comprehension in some way. Lee (2009) argues that readers may show more divergent comprehension patterns when they read two contrasting reading contents: One corresponds with what their belief systems would dictate, and the other does not. Readers apply selective encoding and recall processes. It may be that the negative clash between reader beliefs and text content result in a more intense processing of the text. This may reduce the negative effect of the disagreeable information in comprehending the text. Students in a second language environment encounter a variety of situations in which different reading purposes are inherent. The texts they may deal with may include record cards, forms, immigration documents, notices, telephone directories, town plans, letters, tickets, timetables, price lists, menus, newspaper headlines and advertisements. The sum of these types of texts should activate many different reading strategies (Power, 2009). The curriculum should be flexible to allow embedding reading topics and text types related to learners’ needs and interests, or those upon which there is agreement or shared knowledge or interest. This is important because language communication doesn’t occur without both linguistic and situational context. In the encoding and decoding processes, units of language are weighted differently in terms of their
contribution to the function and meaning of the spoken utterance or written text as a whole. And texts describing roles may be interpreted very differently depending on the way the readers adapt themselves to the tasks they have to perform.

Thus, the first task of teaching English as a second language is to promote (at a cognitive level) the development of new beliefs and opinions. That is to say, it is necessary to develop new patterns of perception that allow readers to free themselves from previous judgments or prejudices. It is a process of designing creative educational spaces; which is necessary in order to encourage divergent thinking (Lee, 2009). Power (2009) discusses also some techniques that the teachers may use in teaching reading. For example, teachers can predict students' knowledge and interest in a certain topic by examining their ability to anticipate text content from reading the title. Whenever the students see an unfamiliar text, or a text that doesn't match their interests they will go back to the most primitive act of sentence-level-reading-habits. Thus, learning has to proceed from familiar to unfamiliar texts.

**Textbook Functions and Evaluation Criteria**

Current trends in evaluating the quality of education, such as in the Program for International Student Assessment (Nogova & Huttova, 2006) focus on two issues; namely students' achievement and their readiness for life. The contemporary theories of learning emphasize the role of students in the active acquisition of new knowledge. Thus, quality textbooks not only serve as the main source of knowledge, they also need to help in developing the student’s personality, in respecting his/her individual
skills, stimulating interest in learning, and in supporting interactivity. Then, needs and interests are the basic drives for learning. Power (2009) argues that they have to be the basis of textbook design as well, especially in the context of language learning. He suggests that the text's type of topic influences the development of readers' comprehension skills. A topic that has connection to learners' lives assists the shift from focusing on sentences' meaning, to focusing on a higher level of synthesizing and comprehending the whole text content.

Stokes (2001) argues relying on a considerable body of research that, creativity can be augmented by instruction. She points out that at least instruction can foster the first three levels in divergent thinking (originality, flexibility, and fluency), in addition to the evidence that explicit instruction can effectively increase divergent thinking outcomes. Divergent thinking abilities are seen, by Stokes, as a set of strategies; these strategies can be learnt and enhanced through instruction and procedures. Stokes argues that in order to be able to teach divergent thinking abilities as strategies, educational systems need to adopt this approach in long terms as lifelong learning processes. In other words, she states that teaching divergent thinking must be explicitly targeted in order to be effective. Teaching strategies that develop divergent thinking include teaching learners how to accept different solutions to the one problem.

Assessing the quality of a textbook requires first understanding of its function. The function of a textbook depends on its target group, curricular area, textbook type,
the manner in which teachers intend to use these materials, and of course the philosophy of the educational system regarding what type of learners we want to produce. According to Mikk as cited in (Nogova & Huttova, 2006) the most important function of a textbook is to motivate students to learn. Motivation includes that textbooks provide appropriate information, acknowledge and encourage different interpretations, develop student’s social skills, develop personal competencies, develop various learning styles, encourage student’s self-learning, provide instructions for lessons, and support teachers' assessment and learners' self assessment (Nogova & Huttova, 2006; Stokes, 2001; & Wells, 1999).

Texts don’t serve only as a transmission function. A text can serve a dialogue function. Unlike the dominant view of texts as merely transferor of information, Wells (1999) argues that texts have constructive and critical role in skill building. Learners use texts as thinking devices when they do writing assignments, for example. Mostly, writing assignments call for reproduction of the ideas in the text or commenting on them. In order to be able to accomplish such assignments, learners find it necessary to use the text as a thinking device; reorganizing information, understanding linking words, thinking of the audience… etc. And through this thinking device learners acquire more advanced skills such as knowledge telling. However, using texts as a tool to solve writing assignments individually is not enough. Vygotsky's (1934) notion of the zone of proximal development suggests an even more effective tool. This tool consists of studying the text collectively rather than individually. In this case, more expert peers can accelerate others'
comprehension of those texts. But this implies that the written texts are designed in a manner that enables teachers to provide for such learning settings.

Thus, when textbooks are assessed, several aspects must be taken into consideration, in light of the literature review (Nogova & Huttova, 2006; Stokes, 2001; Torrance & Goff, 2009; & Wells, 1999). The assessment should include textbooks’ contribution to personality development. This implies content that provide examples from real life, and develops student’s abilities and competencies to appropriately solve real-life problems. Another important aspect is the social relevance of the textbook. In addition, assessment includes compliance with the pedagogical theory adopted by the educational system. It should consider also development of students’ basic skills, student interaction with their broader community, and the usefulness of the content in everyday life. Also, assessment of textbooks should look into the approved methodological approach. This approach includes presentation of educational content in terms of learning, instruction, questions and tasks. Finally, one important aspect is the Graphic Layout. This layout includes graphic presentation of the text and the quality of illustrations in a way that motivates learners.

**Previous Studies**

This section presents review of previous empirical research that investigates creativity development in learners, reading texts' role in the learning process and that attempts to put forth criteria for creative thinking, creative learning and for textbook
evaluation. Besides, this section introduces a group of international and local evaluation studies for Palestinian textbooks.

**Developing Creativity in Learning**

Creativity is a feature that can be developed in learners; especially through reading texts (Karkockiene, 2005). In a study that investigates a program that presents various types of reading texts, Karkockiene concludes that there are real possibilities to develop students’ creativity during the learning process. The study presents a program that can help in improving learners’ ability to evaluate their own level of creativity, originality, ability to create ideas, and curiosity. Results show that students were in fact able, because of these reading texts, to change thinking patterns, improve curiosity levels, come up with new and creative ideas, take risks, have sense of humor, and solve problems effectively. It is argued that intellectual abilities exist in individuals, and the role of the educational process is to maximize their effectiveness (Ballantyne, 2008; & Karkockiene, 2005). Thus, providing reading texts that consider possibilities to develop learners’ creativity is one crucial element in curriculum development.

Curriculum research shows that texts designed for reading classes can take a significant role in enhancing thinking strategies (Chaiklen, 2002; Lee, 2009; & Wells, 1999). In a program called Developing Inquiring Communities in Education Wells (1999) investigated approaching reading texts in effective ways. Based on the results of the program implementation, he argues that texts can't only work as a source for
information, but also can be a tool for thinking and a means to achieve comprehension and produce meaning of the given information. Moreover, students in the program were able to comprehend texts more when they practiced collective dialogues and performed collective writing assignments. This supports Vygotsky' (1934) notion, the zone of proximal development, where working with more expert peers increases learning opportunities. If in a cooperative classroom, texts could serve as a thinking device and as a tool to generate meaning out of information pieces, then they should be designed in a manner that facilitates this function. According to Wells (1999) texts can provide pieces of information to be objects to be transformed into thoughts through dialogue. This enables learners to increase their individual as well as their collective understanding of texts. In light of the notion of zone of proximal development, this view of texts designed for reading classes allow more learning opportunities. Viewing the text as a collective thinking device makes it a cultural tool, because collective work in classrooms is simply a type of cultural activity according to Vygotsky (1934), especially in language classes.

On the other hand, thinking strategies can be developed through textbooks also on an individual level. According to Lee (2009), human memory is reconstructive, in other words individuals tend to reorganize and reevaluate information they keep in memory in accordance with changes in their values and beliefs. Thus, it is important to consider readers’ prior beliefs about a topic and how they will affect the way they comprehend texts. Also, research has shown that existence of information challenging readers’ prior beliefs have stronger impact on
improving memorizing strategies than presenting information that doesn’t contradict
with their beliefs (Chaiklen, 2002; & Lee, 2009).

Fluent and Flexible Learning of English as a Foreign Language

Flexible and fluent learning of English is a matter of providing for systemized,
meaningful and purposeful variability. Stokes (2001) introduces the term "exposure
strategy" meaning that the more individuals are exposed to, introduced to and trained
on procedures, tasks or requirements; the more likely they are to master them.
Mastery in this sense implies adaptation of certain modes of thinking that are specific
for a set of learning tasks.

However, research shows that variability is not being fully considered in the
Palestinian English textbooks. Alfaqawi (2010) finds very little focus in the textbooks
on enhancing learners' abilities to use language forms in different types of syntax. The
author states also that variable introduction to vocabulary and word meanings is
missing. Learners are not encouraged to examine the meaning through root words or
cognates for example. Similarly, Fattash (2010) argues that different aspects of the
unit construct in the textbook are not being integrated and utilized to bring greater
sense of variability. Sentences, words or ideas in the texts, for instance, are not used
properly in encouraging learners to generate different language structures.

Providing for variability means, in addition, greater opportunity for learners to
comprehend texts. A well designed textbook should not only consider differences
between individuals on the same task, but also differences among tasks for the same individual, (Erriccson, 1996; & Stokes, 2001). This approach to variability optimizes the learning chances learners may have. On one hand, learners of different abilities are to be considered, in providing a range of simple to complex language structures for example. On the other hand, each individual learner has to have different tasks to meet their various abilities. Such variance can be achieved in learning tasks that involve writing a cohesive paragraph or answering an open-ended question, for example. Such approach of two-fold variability is missing in the English textbook design where learners are not encouraged to develop or use the sense of variability, especially in terms of syntax learning and language structure (Alfaqawi, 2010).

**Originality in Learning English as a Foreign Language**

Learning language is a creative act in itself, as explained in the literature reviewed above. Guilford (1987) states that "creativity is most reflected in individuals' abilities to initiate things, come up with new ideas, invent new objects or think in new and innovative ways" (p.35). But in order for learners to reach such levels of originality, they need a learning process that enables them to develop their thinking strategies.

Literature provides a number of factors that should be included in textbooks to improve language and thought skills (Alfaqawi, 2010; Fattash; 2010; Mumford; 2001; & Richards, 2001) such as; distinguishing between fiction and non-fiction, fact and opinion, and principles and hypothesis; writing rough drafts independently; defending
ideas and arguing; expressing one self in simplicity and inferring and making generalizations and reaching solutions. In addition, the author highlights textbooks' contribution in encouraging extra reading, as a means to widening learners' horizons and exposure to different language situations. According to the findings of Alfaqawi (2010), the least existing factors of these in the Palestinian English textbooks are encouraging extra reading, inferring and making generalizations; encouraging writing independently; and encouraging self expression. Similarly, Fattash (2010) and Hamdouna (2007) find that textbooks of English don’t encourage nor attempt to develop learners' abilities in independent writing and reading, although these are considered strong provokers of originality in thinking and learning.

Motivation to Learn English as a Foreign Language

Previous studies show that motivating students in second language learning involves personal, cultural, and educational aspects. That is, in order to motivate learners, ESL curriculum should address their personal interests, needs and aspirations; it should widen their horizons and knowledge about both their own culture and the other culture; and it should support their education and fulfill the second language learning goals (Aqel, 2009; Fattash, 2010; Hamdouna, 2007; & Musleh, 2010).

Motivation to learning English as a foreign language is personal. Musleh (2010) investigates the motive of Palestinian students to learn English language. She finds that learner's motivation stems from the belief that I can do it. This belief is
affected by two factors, namely; learners' inner perception of themselves and their competences, and their view of the others' perception of them and their competences. The author relates this to the self-worth theory which indicates a positive impact of self-mage on motivation and academic achievement. However, when learners encounter situations where they feel unable to achieve, they start losing trust in their competence; they start thinking that others have negative perceptions of them as well. This self-helplessness feeling is nourished when students are perceived as negative receiving entities. Perceiving students as negative recipients is a traditional approach to the teaching-learning process. This approach develops learners' feeling of self-helplessness and decreases their feeling of self-worth; thus it affects their personal motivation to learn (Hamdouna, 2007; & Musleh, 2010).

Learners' awareness of their need to learn English and their interest in it have direct impact on their academic achievement. Musleh (2010) states that "learners' motivation to second language learning is affected by the culture and values context they experience in their learning process. The study concludes a two-fold motivation to second language learning among Palestinian students. The first factor is "instrumental" (p.207). This means that in the Palestinian context English language is conceived as an instrument to career and higher education. This instrumentality increases Palestinian students' awareness of their need to the language, and thus increases their motivation to learn it. The study shows that one of the aspects that motivate Palestinian students is interest in knowing about foreigners' cultures. The study shows that Palestinian students’ desire to carry on their higher education is one
of the important motives to learn English as a foreign language. This is related to the theory of *Future Time Perspective*, which shows that learners' present anticipation of their future goals affect their motivation. English is a global language which is becoming the language of all sciences. Thus, it is perceived as the first academic language as well. Similarly Hamdouna (2007) and Fattash (2010) find that this feeling of need and interest of learning English language can motivate learners and enhance their achievement. The authors state, in addition, that learners' actual ability to set their futuristic goals connected to their learning is a very strong motive to them.

Motivation to learn English is cultural. Literature shows that curriculum designers should be interested in developing motivation constructs in the EFL curriculum. Although Palestinian English curriculum includes aspects from different cultures (Fattash, 2010), there is a need to ensure that motivation elements integrate meaningful involvement in cultural aspects. This integration can be achieved through depicting learners' real life situations on one hand and depicting native speakers' real life situations on the other (Aqel, 2009; & Musleh, 2010).

**Evaluation of textbooks and Creativity**

Recent educational research attempts to measure textbooks' effectiveness, through establishing reliable criteria for evaluation (for example: Alfaqawi, 2010; Bitar & Assali, 2008; Fattash, 2010; Hamdouna, 2007; & Sadeq, 2006). To achieve this set of criteria, researchers identified roles and functions of textbooks as the most indicative sources for textbook success in achieving learning goals.
The first set of textbooks’ functions is instructional (Astal, 2008; Hamdouna, 2007; & Nogova & Huttova, 2006). Instructional functions include: provision of a variety of learning resources such as, visuals, activities and reading; correct information and references for a given subject matter, tools for students’ assessment. Instructional functions are needed for learning assessment because textbooks give limits to what is required and expected from students; and provision of guides and clues to the proper methodological approaches to teaching given contents. In addition, textbooks function as a tool to ensure consistency in learning among a given school grade or level.

Nevertheless, textbooks’ are not designed only for instructional purposes. Among the most important functions of textbooks are motivating learners to learn, and to develop their social skills and personal competencies. Textbooks function as tools that help learners in developing various learning approaches, and propel their abilities to self-learning. Textbooks also play a role not only in formal assessment but also in learners’ self assessment (Nogova & Huttova, 2006). Similarly, Bitar and Assali (2008) state in their evaluation of Palestinian National Education textbooks for basic grades, that textbooks are supposed to motivate learners’ desire to learn. The authors argue also that textbooks should be designed in a manner that contributes to learners’ social and personal character development. Researchers focus on the social role of textbooks’ content. It must provide learning contexts that are relevant to learners’ needs, interests, cultural activities and collective experiences (Aqel, 2009; Astal, 2008; Bitar and Assali, 2008; & Nogova & Huttova, 2006).
Textbooks’ evaluation criteria are based on the above mentioned two sets of functions and roles. In other words, good textbooks must comply with standards of good instructional materials and of contextual materials. Therefore, textbooks should comply with factual accuracy, consistency, pedagogical principles, curriculum goals and plans, standards of graphic presentation of text… etc. Textbooks should contain a logical structure and organization. They should also provide examples from real life. Textbooks must integrate learners to their broader community (Astal, 2008; Bitar and Assali, 2008; Musleh, 2010; & Nogova & Huttova, 2006).

In terms of English language textbooks, research shows that they also serve as instructional and social tools. The argument that textbooks can link between the two functions is strong in language learning context. Language learners’ knowledge of linguistic and structural aspects of language is proven to be very much linked to their prior knowledge of the world, and of cultural as well as social aspects (Aqel, 2009; Fattash, 2010; Mazloum & Qeshta, 2007; & Lee, 2009). In fact, language learning in itself is viewed as a social process. Vygotsky (1934) argues that language is a social tool that develops on two consecutive levels: social or collective experiences and internal experiences. According to Vygotsky, internal competence of language in individuals can’t be achieved unless the social level is achieved first.

There is an increased value to social and motivation features in language textbooks, as learning language in itself is a social need. Language is a thinking tool as well. Therefore, researchers have paid special attention to which type of contexts,
language textbooks should provide (for example: Fattash, 2010; Lee, 2009; & Power, 2009; & Schuz, 2004). It is agreed among many researchers that learners’ local social and cultural aspects must be illustrated in the textbooks, but looking at language as a thinking tool made some researchers (Alfaqawi, 2010; Fattash, 2010; Less, 2009; & Power 2009) investigate the provision of other unfamiliar cultural aspects and contexts in language textbooks. Lee (2009) conducts a study that aims at evaluating the effect of providing reading texts that include arguments, beliefs, interests and social experiences that differ and/ or contradict with readers’ social experiences. The author concludes that this strategy in most of the cases gives more opportunities to language learning and to development of thinking strategies than those created by reading texts that provide only familiar cultural and social experiences; “It may be that the negative clash between reader beliefs and text content resulted in a more intense processing of the text, compensating for any debilitating role of the disagreeable information in text comprehension” (Lee, 2009: 161). Fattash (2010) points that local cultural context in language learning is of great significance as learners need language in their real life social acts. Power (2009), argues that second language learning is responsive to learners’ social needs, but they are not going to use this second language in conducting their local cultural acts. Instead, they learn the second language to be able of using it in other social contexts. Thus, providing the “target” language cultural context is an important aspect.

Review of the previous studies shows that creativity is not a rigid characteristic of individuals that cannot be developed. On the contrary, the teaching
learning process, in general, and reading text's design, in the context of language learning, can provide opportunities for development of creative abilities in learners. Research provides also a set of functions for textbooks in the teaching learning process.

In conclusion, one might say: the research shows that creativity is not a rigid characteristic of individuals that can't be developed. On the contrary, the teaching learning process, in general, and reading text's design, in the context of language learning in particular, can provide opportunities for development of creative abilities in learners. Research provides also a set of functions for textbooks in the teaching learning process. The following conclusions summarize results of research reviewed on creativity, language learning and texts' content design:

1. Creativity is a twofold concept that relates to two sources; mental abilities and its personal products. Any creative text has three components; creative content, creative operations (methods) and creative products (learners' progress and development).
2. Creativity can be achieved through interaction between two types of cognitive operations, namely divergent and convergent operations.
3. Divergent operations include fluent, flexible and original thinking processes.
4. Personal motivation is an important factor in creative production.
5. Lifelong learning is mostly related to acquisition of creative problem solving skills.
6. Education and instruction systems, including design of textbooks, must focus on developing divergent modes of thinking where creative problem solving can be enhanced.

7. In language acquisition and learning context, communicative approach enables learners’ divergent thinking and creative problem solving.

8. Language is a crucial tool in the process of cognitive development. Advanced modes of thought are transmitted to the child by language.

9. Creativity can be developed in learners. It is not a rigid characteristic of individuals. It can be developed by explicit training.

10. There is an essential interchange between thought and speech in terms of providing a development source to one another.

11. Texts designed for reading classes can take a significant role in enhancing thinking strategies.

12. Reading text's design can provide opportunities for development of creative abilities in learners.

13. Textbook's evaluation is based on a set of instructional and motivational functions and roles, which a given textbook must accomplish.
Chapter Three

Design and Methodology

This study is conducted to assess the creativity level of the textbook design of English texts for 4\textsuperscript{th} – 6\textsuperscript{th} grades in Palestine. Evaluation is based on qualitative design. This chapter introduces the research design as well as the methodology and operations that are used to make the necessary evaluation. The methodology would cover target population and sample, instrumentation, sources of data collection and tools of statistical analysis.

Research Design

The present study aims at evaluating the creativity level of English textbooks for 4\textsuperscript{th} – 6\textsuperscript{th} grades. It attempts to answer the following questions:

1. To which extent are textbooks (instructional material) of EFL for grades (4\textsuperscript{th}-6\textsuperscript{th}) creative in their content design as measured by the creativity scale from the raters view point?

   A. To which extent are the instructional materials in comprehension passages designed creatively?

   B. To which extent are the instructional materials in evaluation sections designed creatively?
C. Does the content of instructional materials motivate students to learn EFL creatively at the level of comprehension passages?

D. Does the content of instructional materials motivate students to learn EFL creatively at the level of evaluation activities?

2. To which extent are the textbooks of EFL for grades (4th-6th) creative from the teachers' viewpoint?

The design in this study uses a qualitative approach in triangulated data. This approach refers to the application and combination of several research methodologies in studying the same phenomenon (Holst, 1969). In the case of the present study the research will apply mixed qualitative methodologies. Triangulation is used in the sense that there are three sources of data: 1). Data generated from content analysis by this researcher and by one TEFL supervisor; 2) Data generated from content analysis by a focus group of 7 English language teachers; and 3). Data generated from in-depth interviews with the 7 teachers, and 2 English supervisors.

The design covers four stages for operations to be used in answering the question of this study.

Stage one: Developing a framework for evaluation scales of creativity in texts' content design (see appendix 2, p. 136).

Stage two: Designing a scale for measuring creativity from the most relevant literature review to the knowledge of this researcher (see appendix 1, p. 129).
Stage Three: evaluating the scale by a group of referees.

Stage Four: Creating a checklist for the procedures needed to answer the research questions (see procedures, p. 52).

**Methodology**

The researcher uses a qualitative methodology. The sources of its data are basically one of triangular nature. The purpose of this triangulation is to enhance validity of findings, and double check findings of each of the methods against findings derived from other methods. The rationale of using this methodology is that it is a preferable methodology that suits social sciences studies among which this research study is classified, educational research (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2000).

Thus, the methods used here are; qualitative relational content analysis of textbooks used by this researcher, one TEFL expert, qualitative relational content analysis of textbooks used by a focus group of teachers; and in-depth interviews with the English language teachers and supervisors.

Content analysis is defined as "a systematic, replicable technique for compressing many words of text into fewer content categories based on explicit rules of coding" (Stemler, 2001, p. 4). It is worth while saying that content analysis is a useful method in examining trends and patterns in documents. Relational content analysis includes word frequency counts, identification of words of potential interest investigation of consistency and patterns, coding and categorizing data and making
inferences (Holsti, 1969; & Stemler, 2001). In the present study, these five operations have been used to make the content analysis for the texts sample (see appendix 9, pp. 202-302). The steps mentioned above are used in developing the content analysis scale matrix below. The following example illustrates the usage of the five steps of content analysis.

Example:

Vocabulary (noun, verb, adjective or adverb)

a) At least 3 new words;

b). Not less than 3 frequency occurrences for each word; and

c) Not less than 3 form each.

1). Word frequency: such as in b and c above, word frequency is taken into account, as well as presentation of various forms of each word.

2). Identification of words of potential interest: frequency of new words in new forms is an indicator of potential interest; therefore it is given a considerable weight of the score.

3). Consistency and patterns: provision of 3 new words at least in each unit, and certain number of forms. In other items in the scale provision of the condition in at
least 2/3 of the following units or evaluation activities for example is given a considerable weight because it reflects patterns.

4). Coding and categorizing data: the above example is coded as vocabulary in content passages; it is categorized as conditions related to fluent and flexible thinking in content passages.

5). Making inferences: results of content analysis are tabulated and compared to each other.

In-depth interview is a qualitative research technique. It involves conducting intensive individual interviews with a small number of respondents. The purpose of the in-depth interview is to explore respondents' perspectives on a particular idea, program, or situation (Boyce & Neale, 2006, p. 5). This technique provides more detailed information than what is available through other data collection methods, such as surveys. In addition, it motivates the respondents as they feel the importance of having deep conversation about things related to their lives. In-depth interviews are used to reveal the underlying motives and attitudes of seven teachers and two supervisors regarding the English textbooks in question. The purpose of these in-depth interviews is providing more insight to the results of their content analysis (see Appendix 4, p 149 for the in-depth interviews). It is worth mentioning that the in-depth interview content is analyzed by using grounded theory technique. In this technique teachers' responses are classified into themes and tabulated and presented
in tables. Results are presented in narrated form and discussed as they relate to the findings of the content analysis generated data.

**Population and Sample**

There are two types of populations. First population refers to the textbooks under investigation. It constitutes three English Language Textbooks of (4th – 6th grades) used in the Palestinian public schools. This covers 6 books (a student book and, a work book for each grade). The second population refers to 7 English teachers of grades 4-6 in primary public schools of Ramallah and Al-Bireh Directorate, and 2 English language supervisors.

**Sampling**

A). Textbook sample

Sampling covers the two types of population mentioned above. The textbooks' sample is a stratified sample as seen in table (2.1). The sample size is 9 text units: 3 text units from the 24 units given in each textbook. Each unit sample includes a lesson of comprehension, evaluation questions and applications, in addition to a number of exercises in the workbook varies from one textbook to another. Sample text units were stratified to include the same number of units from each grade textbook. Within each textbook, units were numbered (1, 2, 3 … 24). Every other unit were selected first (2, 4, 6…22). The resulting sample was stratified in the same manner until 3 text units were selected (6, 14, 22) from each textbook. In conclusion
the sample constitutes 3 text units from each textbook, which make up a sample of 9 text units (see appendix 9, p. 202)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Sample units</th>
<th>Unit number</th>
<th>Unit Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unit 6</td>
<td>No title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unit 14</td>
<td>No title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Unit 22</td>
<td>No title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Unit 6</td>
<td>Basketball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Unit 14</td>
<td>Fairouz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Unit 22</td>
<td>An email from China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Unit 6</td>
<td>A head full of ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Unit 14</td>
<td>The wind that moved a house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Unit 22</td>
<td>To fly like a bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B). Teachers and Experts' Sample
A convenient sample of 7 teachers is chosen to form a focus group. They are chosen to be the source of data on evaluation of creativity level of text design for the textbooks they use. The language experts group consists of a convenient sample of 2 English language supervisors. A third supervisor conducted the content analysis based on the developed scale.

Procedures

The following procedures are applied to conduct the research:

1. Develop a scale for creative textbook content design relying on the reviewed literature (appendix1, p. 137).
2. Present the scale for a group of 6 expert referees
3. Adjust the scale according to the referees’ feedback (add, remove or modify paragraphs)

4. Apply the scale on a pilot sample by this researcher

5. Sampling for textbook comprehension lessons

6. Transcription of all data in the chosen sample

7. Conducting content analysis by this researcher and another expert according to the developed scale.

8. Conducting content analysis by a focus group of 7 teachers and 2 supervisors.

9. Tabulation of results of the three content analyses.

10. Conducting in-depth interviews with the teachers to have more insight on the results of content analysis.

11. First phase of data analysis: Conducting comparison between results of content analysis carried out by this researcher, the expert and the teacher focus group.

12. Second phase of data analysis: discussion and reflection on the whole results in light of the in-depth interviews results, and the reviewed literature.

**Instrumentation**

Based on the literature review and the conceptual framework a creativity scale was developed by the researcher (see cited scale in appendix 2, p. 136). The scale measures the three areas of creativity as identified by Guilford's Structure of the Intellect Model (flexibility and fluency, originality and motivation). This scale is used
in two forms for collecting the relevant data (i.e. content analysis matrix, and in-depth interviews checklist). Six expert referees judged the scale. The scale as such was modified accordingly.

Table (2) shows the distribution of creativity items given in the scale on the six aspects for comprehension content and evaluation content.

### Table (2)

**Creativity items distributed by comprehension and evaluation content** (see appendix 1, p. 129 for the stated creativity items in the scale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehension Content Area (scale item #)</th>
<th>Evaluation Content Area (scale item #)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flexible and fluent thinking</td>
<td>Original thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original thinking</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible and fluent thinking</td>
<td>Original thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tools of Statistical Analysis**

The researcher gives value to each item in the content analysis matrix. This value is determined on the basis of five-point scale. This score is distributed on the components of any given evaluation item according to its weight relevant to creativity measure. The weight of each is decided on the basis of sound language and possible forms in making the content creative (convergence and divergence characteristics). For example, creativity in language style sentence presentation is measured according to two components: that a text includes at least 2 sentence styles, and that each style is presented not less than 3 times. These components are evaluated according to the
fact that sentence formation takes four styles of presentation. The more varied sentence style given in a text the more creative it will be.

Results are tabulated according to the three major areas of investigation (flexibility and fluency, originality and motivation) in each sample and each textbook, and on levels of comprehension sections and evaluation sections. Tabulation ensures clearer comparison between the three raters (this researcher (R1), TEFL Expert (R2) and the teachers' focus group (R3)). Besides the validity acquired from the referees' feedback, methodological triangulation is used in order to ensure validity of content analysis results. Multiple methods of data collection are used (including in-depth interviews). As for reliability of content analysis, the process should be consistent; that is, different people (raters) should analyze texts in the same way (Stemler, 2001). This is ensured through the content analysis matrix. Reliability of content analysis is measured also by the percent of agreement between and among raters: adding the number of cases that were coded the same way and dividing by the total number of cases (Stemler, 2001).

Content of In-depth interviews is analyzed by clustering themes that are seen by the researcher’s qualitative analyses for yielded views. Validity of the questions in the interviews is derived from the modifications based on the referees' feedback.

In order to calculate reliability of the content analysis, raters' agreement equation as described by (Stemler, 2001) is used. This equation describes the number of items which got identical scores by all the raters, divided by the total number of
items, multiplied by 100. Raters' agreement \( \% = \frac{N \text{ items with identical scores}}{N \text{ items in level}} \times 100 \)

The equation assumes that “100%” result is perfectly reliable and "0%" indicates no agreement at all. In other words, total reliability ranges (0% - 100%). Accepted reliability agreement percentage ranges from (61% - 100%) (See table 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Strength of Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;0.00</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00 - 0.20</td>
<td>Slight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.21 - 0.40</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.41 - 0.60</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0.61-0.80</strong></td>
<td><strong>Substantial</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.81-1.00</td>
<td>Almost Perfect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accordingly, the content analysis creativity scale is reliable at the level of 61.4%. The highest reliability for the scale (69.4%) is for the criteria items on flexible and fluent thinking as seen in evaluating the comprehension passages. Whereas, the lowest reliability percentage (55.5%) is given to the scores of items related to flexible and fluent thinking as seen in evaluating the evaluation activities of the textbooks (see table 4). Thus, the scale has substantial reliability in general as well as in criteria items of flexible and fluent thinking in comprehension (69.4%), originality (63.4%) and motivation (64.8%) in evaluation, in particular. Nevertheless; its reliability is moderate for the criteria items concerning flexibility and fluency in
evaluation (55.5%), as well as for the criteria items on originality (59.2%) and motivation (59.26%) in comprehension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creativity levels/ criteria items as given in appendix 1, p. 129</th>
<th>4th Grade</th>
<th>5th Grade</th>
<th>6th Grade</th>
<th>Total with identical scores</th>
<th>Grand total of criteria items</th>
<th>Agreement %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility and fluency in comprehension</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility and fluency in evaluation</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originality and ability to synthesize in comprehension passages</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originality and ability to synthesize in evaluation activities</td>
<td>S4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation in comprehension passages</td>
<td>S5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation in evaluation activities</td>
<td>S6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>S7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example of raters' implementation of the Creativity Scale**

This section presents an example of how the researcher implemented the creativity scale to conclude the results described in Chapter Four. The example is taken from the researcher's evaluation of Sample number One (unit 6 from the fourth grade textbook), see appendix 9, pp. 204-206 for the sample unit, and appendix 6, p. 179 for the content analysis of this researcher.
The first section of the scale is specified for evaluation of comprehension passages at the creativity level of flexibility and fluency. Items (1-4 and 11) are related to this level as indicated by table 2.

Item one: language style sentence presentation (declarative, interrogative, imperative or conditional:

a). not less than two styles (3 points out of 5)

b). not less than 3 presentations each style (2 points out of 5)

The rater scans the passage to count how many sentence style presentations there are, and the frequency of each of them. In this sample, only one style is used (declarative), therefore the passage scores (1 out of 3). This presentation is frequent more than three times, but the case is that it is the only style in the passage; therefore, the rater records half of the points specified for this aspect (1 out of 2). Thus, the score of the first item for this sample is the sum of the scores for its sub-criteria items (1+1=2). To illustrate further, sub-criteria number 11 in the Creativity Scale is related to the level of originality in comprehension passages. In calculations used in Chapter Four, the scores considered for this sub-criteria is the average of the scores given by the three raters, not only rater one.
Chapter Four

Findings on the Evaluation of Palestinian 4th-6th Grades' EFL Textbooks for Their Content Creativity Level

This chapter presents the findings on the evaluation of Palestinian English textbooks (4th-6th grades) and the creativity level of their content design. Findings are presented in relation to three data sources: 1). Data generated from content analysis by this researcher and by one TEFL supervisor; 2) Data generated from content analysis by a focus group of 7 English language teachers; and 3). Data generated from in-depth interviews with the 7 teachers, and 2 English supervisors. Content analysis method is used to analyze the content of the sample textbooks and the teacher interviews. The findings are classified according to the creativity scale, (see appendix 1, p.129).

This chapter presents the descriptive statistical analysis of the scores of three raters. It presents as well descriptive statistical analysis of the outcomes derived from teachers' in-depth interviews. These findings and outcomes are discussed in Chapter Five.

The questions of this study, which will be answered sequentially; are:

1. To which extent are textbooks (instructional material) of EFL for grades (4th-6th) creative in their content design as measured by the creativity scale from the raters view point?
A. To which extent are the instructional materials in comprehension passages designed creatively?

B. To which extent are the instructional materials in evaluation sections designed creatively?

C. Does the content of instructional materials motivate students to learn EFL creatively at the level of comprehension passages?

D. Does the content of instructional materials motivate students to learn EFL creatively at the level of evaluation activities?

2. To which extent are the textbooks of EFL for grades (4th-6th) creative from the teachers' viewpoint?

The scale is applied by three raters; namely this researcher (R1), one TEFL expert (R2) and a focus group of 7 teachers (R3) who implemented the scale collectively and made consensus on the scores. The score of these raters in light of the content analysis are presented in three different tables in (appendixes, 6, 7, and 8, p.p. 179-195) respectively. It should be remembered here that the sample is composed of three units for each class (4th grade, 5th grade and 6th grade) the three units from each class are evaluated by each of the three raters (R1, R2 & R3). Appendix 5 shows the distribution of raters' scores on creativity level for each item among the 36 items of the creativity scale. Each sample score is classified pass or fail according to the scale: (1) pass the creativity criteria= 3-5, and (2) fail the creativity criteria= less than 3.
Table (5) shows the averages of sample scores given by the three raters for each item in the creativity scale based on appendix 5. It should be remembered that levels of creativity are measured in terms of flexibility and fluency, originality and motivation in both comprehension passages and evaluation activities. However, table 5 presents averages of scores of all criteria items prior to classification into creativity levels. That is, I started with collecting scores given by each rater (given in appendices 6, 7 and 8) and presenting them in appendix 5, then calculating average of scores by three raters as presented in appendix 5, and presenting them in table 5 below.

Table (5)
Sample average of creativity scores distributed on the creativity scale items (source: appendix 5, p. 176)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>4th Grade</th>
<th>5th Grade</th>
<th>6th Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>S3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Language style sentence presentation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sentence structure variations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Repetition of new words in subsequent units</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Presentation of new vocabulary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Openness to more than one answer</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sentence formation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Understanding new vocabulary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Search for information</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Previous knowledge</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sound variations</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Effective warm up activities</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Potential for various teaching methodologies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Dealing with learners' misconceptions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>New linguistic knowledge</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Open-mindedness</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section One: Textbook Design Level of Creativity in Comprehension Passages and Evaluation Activities

This section aims at presenting descriptive statistical data on the level of creativity in comprehension passages and in evaluation activities of English (4th-6th) grades' textbooks, as measured by the developed content analysis matrix (see appendix 5, p. 176). As mentioned before, this scale is used by three raters; namely this researcher, one TEFL expert and a focus group of 7 teachers who implemented
the scale collectively and made consensus on the scores (see appendix 6, p. 179; appendix 7, p. 187; and appendix 8, p. 195).

This section presents findings in terms of two aspects of creativity; namely features of textbooks that provoke fluent and flexible thinking and features that enhance ability to synthesize and think originally.

Table (6) shows the level of creativity in comprehension passages in terms of providing flexible and fluent thinking. Contribution of comprehension passages in the development of flexible and fluent thinking in learners is low in general (47.6%). Findings show that the less available requirement (36.2%) for flexible and fluent thinking is the reuse of vocabulary in subsequent units. However, presentation of new vocabulary achieved the highest score (58.2%) among other sub-criteria items. Nevertheless, it failed the creativity level needed which is (60%).

Findings reported in table (6) indicate also the level of creativity in the comprehension passages of each sample unit in terms of flexibility and fluency. It is observed that all sample units fail the criteria for a creative textbook design in terms of flexibility and fluency in comprehension. The samples from (1-9) achieved the following levels of creativity respectively, (40%, 43%, 46.6%, 42%, 44%, 50%, 53%, 55% and 55%). Samples 7, 8 and 9 (units 6, 14 and 22 of the 6th grade textbook, pp. 276-301) achieved the highest levels. These samples achieved their highest scores (3.8, 4 and 4) in providing variations in sentence structure, and their next highest scores (3, 3 and 2.8) in the effective presentation of new vocabulary within the same
passage. However, these samples got their lowest scores (2, 2 and 2) in providing various sentence styles and in effective integration of the new vocabulary in the subsequent units. The other samples failed most of the requirements except in three cases; namely, samples 3 and 6 (unit 22 from the 4th grade textbook and unit 22 from the 5th grade textbook, see table 1 for textbook samples) scored 3 in the effective presentation of new vocabulary within the passage; and sample 6 achieved also 3 points in providing various sentence structures.

Table (6)

Average and percentage of creativity level in terms of fluency and flexibility in comprehension passages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Sub-criteria</th>
<th>S 1</th>
<th>S 2</th>
<th>S 3</th>
<th>S 4</th>
<th>S 5</th>
<th>S 6</th>
<th>S 7</th>
<th>S 8</th>
<th>S 9</th>
<th>Average for each sub-criterion/ 5</th>
<th>% of each sub-criterion</th>
<th>P/F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Language style sentence presentation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sentence structure variations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Repetition of new words in subsequent units</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Presentation of new vocabulary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total average for each sample unit</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of each sample unit on average</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (7) shows the creativity level in terms of originality in comprehension passages for each sub-criterion and for each sample unit. Findings show that the sample of the three textbooks fails at all sub-criteria of originality aspect of creativity.
in comprehension passages on average (57.91%). The most available requirement here is presenting new linguistic knowledge (72%); whereas, the least available one is introducing warm up activities (43.2%).

The findings show as well creativity levels in each sample unit regarding the promotion of original thinking and the ability to synthesize. Sample 8 (unit 14 from the 6th grade textbook) is the most creative, as it achieved (69.4%). This successful sample got its highest score (4.5) in encouraging tolerance and resilience in learning, and next highest scores (3.5 and 3.3) in providing new linguistic knowledge and providing opportunity for more than one teaching strategy. The lowest score (2.3) is in the opportunities it provides for effective warm up activities.

Samples 6 and 9 (unit 22 from the 5th grade textbook and unit 22 from the 6th grade textbook) also passed the creativity criteria for originality in comprehension, as they achieved (64.2% and 63.6%) respectively. These successful samples got their highest scores (4 and 4.5) in providing new linguistic knowledge and encouraging tolerance and resilience in learning sequentially. They achieved their next highest scores (3.6 & 3.5) in tolerance and resilience in learning and new linguistic knowledge sequentially. These two samples achieved their lowest scores (2.3 & 2), in presenting effective warm up activities.

The least creative sample is the first (unit 6 from the 4th grade textbook) which achieved (48.2%). Despite being successful in the requirement of providing new linguistic knowledge with a score of 4, this sample failed to provide more than one
teaching strategy, deal with misconceptions, and encourage resilience and tolerance and to present effective warm up activities.

Samples 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7 (units 14 & 22 from the 4th grade textbook, units 6 & 14 from the 5th grade textbook and unit 6 from the 6th grade textbook) also failed the creativity criteria for originality in comprehension. These samples achieved (52.4%, 54%, 56.4%, 55% and 56.8%) respectively. Although these samples fail most of the requirements, all of them got high scores in providing new linguistic knowledge (4, 3.3, 3.6, 3 and 4.3) respectively. All of these samples achieved high scores also in their potential to provide more than one learning style (3, 3, 3, 3 and 3), such as individual learning, group work or scaffolding in learning. Samples 4, 5 and 7 achieved high scores also in encouraging tolerance and resilience in learning (3.5, 3.5 and 4.3). And, samples 2, 3 and 5 scored (3.5, 3.5 and 3.5) in their potential to provide more than one teaching strategy. However, these scores still fail most of the requirements. For example, these samples achieved very low scores in presenting warm up activities (2.7, 2.5, 2, 2 and 2) respectively, and in dealing with learners’ misconceptions (1.2, 1.6, 2.5, 1.3 and 2, 8) sequentially, see table (7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table (7)</th>
<th>Average and percentage of creativity level in terms of originality in comprehension passages for each sub-criterion and for each sample unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 11</td>
<td>Sub -Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Introductory warm up activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Potential for various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation activities' contribution to flexible and fluent thinking in learners is presented in table (8). Findings show that the general creativity level in terms of this aspect is 55%. The most available requirements here are sound variation (70.6%) and provision of previous knowledge (69.2%). However, the ability to evaluate sentence formation creatively is the lowest (47.4%). Also, the evaluation activities' contribution in evaluating learners' understanding of new vocabulary is low (49.4%).

Sample 9 (p. 298) achieved the highest creativity level (67%). This sample passed all the requirements for flexible and fluent thinking in evaluation activities. It got its highest score in encouraging search for information, and its next highest scores (4 & 3.5) in evaluating learning of sound variations and in integrating previous knowledge respectively. However, its lowest scores (3, 3.2 and 3.2) were achieved in the evaluation activities' openness to more than one answer, their contribution in
evaluating learners' understanding of new vocabulary, and in evaluating learners' ability to form sentences.

Samples 7 and 8 (units 6 & 14 from the 6th grade textbook) are also successful samples; they achieved (61% & 61.4%) sequentially. Sample 7 got its highest score (4) in evaluating learning of sound variations, and its next highest score (3.2) in the evaluation activities' openness to more than one more answer. This sample got identical score (3) in the rest of the requirements, see table 8 below. On the other hand, sample 8 got its highest score (4) in integrating previous knowledge, and its next highest score (3.5) in encouraging search for information. This sample go high scores (3.2, 3 and 3) also in providing activities that are open to more than one answer, providing effective evaluation of sentence formation and evaluating sound variations' learning respectively. However, this sample failed the requirement of evaluating learners' understanding of new vocabulary, with a 2.5 score.

Samples 1-6 (units 6, 14 & 22 from the 4th grade textbook and units 6, 14 & 22 from the 5th grade textbook) all failed the creativity criteria in terms of evaluation activities and their contribution in provoking flexible and fluent thinking. Most of these samples achieved their highest scores (4, 4, 4, 3 & 3) in evaluating learning of sound variations, except for sample 1 which failed the requirement (2.8). All these samples got also high scores in integrating previous knowledge (4, 3, 3.6, 3, 3, 3 & 4) for samples 1-6 sequentially. However, these samples failed most of the other requirements. For example, sample 1 (unit 6 from the 4th grade textbook) scored only
(1) in evaluating sentence formation, (1.8) in encouraging search for information, and
(2) in evaluating learners' understanding of new vocabulary. Sample 2 (unit 14 from
the 4th grade textbook) scored only (1.7) in evaluating sentence formation and (1.8) in
evaluating learners' understanding of new vocabulary. Sample 3 (unit 22 from the 4th
grade textbook) scored only (1.6) in evaluating sentence formation, (1.8) in
evaluating learners' understanding of new vocabulary, and (2) in evaluation activities'
openness to more than one answer.

It is observed that the three samples from the 5th grade textbook achieved
better than those from the 4th textbook, but they failed the criteria as well. These
samples achieved successful scores in requirements related to evaluation of sound
variation learning (4, 4 & 4) and integration of previous knowledge (3, 3 & 4).
However they failed most of the requirements. For example, these three samples got
(2.3, 2.3 and 2) in evaluation activities' openness to more than one answer, and (2, 2.5
and 3) in evaluating learners' understanding of new vocabulary, see table (8).

Table (8)
Average and percentage of creativity level in terms of flexibility and fluency in
evaluation activities (for each sub-criterion and for each sample unit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>item</th>
<th>sub- criteria</th>
<th>s1</th>
<th>s2</th>
<th>s3</th>
<th>s4</th>
<th>s5</th>
<th>s6</th>
<th>s7</th>
<th>s8</th>
<th>s9</th>
<th>average for each sub-criterion/5</th>
<th>% of each sub-criterion</th>
<th>p/f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>openness to more than one answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>sentence formation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>understanding new vocabulary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>search for information</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table (9) shows results of evaluation activities' content analysis in terms of their contribution to the development of original thinking and the ability to synthesize. Evaluation activities' contribution in this aspect is generally low (42.4%). While the most creative aspect here is evaluating language skills learning (56.8%), the least creative evaluation aspect is focused on self-initiated projects (35.6%). It is worth mentioning also that evaluating the abilities in free writing activities is very low (37.4%).

It is observed that all samples failed the creativity criteria in terms of evaluation activities' contribution to the development of original thinking and the ability to synthesize. Sample 8 (unit 14 from the 6th grade textbook) achieved the highest level (58.8%). Although this sample failed the criteria, it achieved some high scores in the requirements. For example, it got its highest score (4) in providing self-initiated projects, and its next highest score (3.8) in providing extracurricular activities. This sample succeeded also in evaluating learning language skills (3.3) and in evaluating the ability to paraphrase (3). However, sample 8 scored only (1.7) in providing creative text title, and (2) in providing free writing activities. It is worth
mentioning that most of the sample units' levels of creativity are less than 50%. Only
two sample units (14 and 22) from the sixth grade textbook scored 58.8% and 52.2%
respectively, see table (9). Sample 2 (unit 14 from the 4th grade textbook) achieved
the lowest level (35.2%). This sample got its highest score (2.5) in evaluating the
ability to paraphrase, and its next highest score (2) in providing extracurricular
activities. It achieved the lowest score (0.5) in providing creative text title, see table
(9).

Table (9)
Average and percentage of creativity level in terms of originality in evaluation
activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Sub- Criteria</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>S5</th>
<th>S6</th>
<th>S7</th>
<th>S8</th>
<th>S9</th>
<th>Average for each sub-criterion / 5</th>
<th>% of each sub-criterion</th>
<th>P/F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Text tile</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Ability to paraphrase</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Free writing activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Learning of language skills</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Self initiated projects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Extracurricular activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Effective learning strategies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total average for each sample unit</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of each sample unit on average</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section Two: Textbook Design Creativity Level in Motivating Students to Learn

This section aims at presenting descriptive statistical data on the level of creativity in comprehension passages and in evaluation activities of English (4th-6th) grades' textbooks, as measured by the developed content analysis matrix (see appendix 5, p. 176) in terms of their contribution to motivating learners for creative learning. As mentioned before, this scale is used by three categories of raters; namely this researcher, one TEFL expert and a focus group of 7 teachers who implemented the scale collectively (see Appendices 6-8, pp. 179-203 for scores by each rater).

Table (10) shows the level of creativity of comprehension passages in terms of their text design to motivate learners to learn creatively. Results show that the comprehension passages are 61% creative in this aspect. The highest creativity level is found in the comprehension passages' fulfillment of EFL learning objectives (70.2%). However, the lowest creativity percentage is found in motives to search for extra reading (51.6%). It is important to notice also that comprehension passages' consideration of learners' interests and presentation of challenging learning situations achieved relatively low percentages (56% and 56.6% respectively).

While the comprehension passage in sample 7 (unit 6 in the 6th grade textbook) is the most creative in terms of motivating learners (71%), the least creative comprehension passage is that of sample 3 (unit 14 in the 4th grade textbook) which achieved (48.4%). It is worth mentioning that most of the sample units achieved high scores in regards to their comprehension passages' ability to motivate learners; only
three sample units (6, 14 & 22 from the fourth grade textbook) scored less than 60%, see table (10).

In more details, 6 samples (4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9) out of 9 were successful in terms of this creativity level. These samples achieved (61.6%, 60%, 66.4%, 71%, 67% and 66.6%) respectively. Even the failed samples achieved a successful results in 2/3 of the requirements at least, see table 10.

Table (10)
Average and percentage of creativity level in terms of motivation in comprehension passages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>S5</th>
<th>S6</th>
<th>S7</th>
<th>S8</th>
<th>S9</th>
<th>Average for each sub-criterion/5</th>
<th>% of each sub-criterion</th>
<th>P/F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Consideration of learners' interests</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Integration of knowledge from other disciplines</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Fulfillment of objectives from learning EFL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Challenging learners' knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Encouraging extra reading</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Rewarding creativity and social involvement</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total average for each sample unit</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of each sample unit on average</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table (11) shows the results of evaluation activities' content design related to motivating learners creatively. Results show that the level of creativity in the design of these evaluation activities is 50.03%. The highest creativity level is found in the evaluation activities' promotion of students' interaction (62.8%). However, the lowest creativity level is found in the evaluation activities' promotion of social appreciation of creativity (27.4%).

In terms of evaluation activities' creativity levels in each sample unit, results show that the most creative unit is Unit 14 from the 6th grade textbook (73%). This sample got its highest score (4) in integrating learners’ needs, encouraging creative act and encouraging reasoning. It got its next highest score (3.6) in providing for learners’ interaction. The sample didn’t fail any of the requirements, the lowest score (3) is for promoting social rewarding of creativity.

The least creative sample is the fourth (unit 6 from the 5th grade textbook) which achieved 38.4%. This sample succeeded only in one requirement, providing for learners’ interaction with 3 points score. It achieved only (1) in encouraging creative act and in promoting social rewarding of creativity.

The other samples failed the criteria as well. They didn’t achieve most of the requirements. For example, the first sample scored only 0.5 regarding promoting social rewarding of creativity. Sample 5 achieved only (1) in encouraging creative act and in promoting social rewarding of creativity. However, some of the samples succeeded in some of the requirements. For example, sample 1 passed in two of the
requirements with score (3) in promoting learners’ interaction and in integrating learners’ needs, see table (11).

**Table (11)**

Average and percentage of creativity level in terms of motivation in evaluation activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Sub- Criteria</th>
<th>S 1</th>
<th>S 2</th>
<th>S 3</th>
<th>S 4</th>
<th>S 5</th>
<th>S 6</th>
<th>S 7</th>
<th>S 8</th>
<th>S 9</th>
<th>Average for each sub-criterion/5</th>
<th>% of each sub-criterion</th>
<th>P/F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Focus on learners' interaction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Consideration of learners' interests</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Consideration of learners' needs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Encouraging creative acts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Social rewarding of creativity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Encouraging reasoning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section Three: Level of Creativity in Textbook Design**

This section aims at presenting descriptive statistical data on the level of creativity in the content design of English (4<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup>) grades' textbooks, as measured by
the developed content analysis scale (appendix 1, 129). Creativity level for each textbook’s content, on averages and in percentages is given in tables (12, 13 & 14).

Table (14) indicates that the highest creativity levels in comprehension and evaluation are found in the 6th grade textbook (60.3%). The 6th grade textbook passes the creativity criteria and is the most creative (68.2%) textbook design in terms of the ability of its comprehension to motivate learners to learn creatively (table 12). However, the lowest creativity level for the 6th grade (52.2%) creativity is found in its evaluation activities’ ability to encourage original thinking and ability to synthesize, as seen in table (13).

The least creative textbook design, according to the content analysis results, is the 4th grade textbook. The general level of creativity in 4th grade textbook is 46.5% which fails the creativity criteria, see table (14). Its highest creativity level (52.4%) is found in its comprehension passages' contribution in propelling motivation in learners. However, the level of its evaluation activities' creativity in provoking originality and ability to synthesize is the lowest (37.4%), see tables (12 & 13). The 5th grade textbook achieved a general level of 50.4% in creativity as measured by the content analysis matrix, see table (14). Its highest creativity level (62.6%) is found in the contribution of its comprehension passages in motivating learners to learn creatively. Whereas, the lowest creativity level (37.6%) for the 5th grade textbook is found in its’ evaluation activities' contribution in provoking original thinking and ability to synthesize, see tables (12 & 13).
It is observed also, that creativity levels in the comprehension passages are higher than in evaluation activities, generally. For example the level of creativity related to originality in comprehension in the fourth grade textbook is 51.4%, while in the evaluation activities in the same textbook is 37.4%.

In the 5th grade textbook, the level of creativity related to motivation in comprehension passages is 62.6%, whereas in the evaluation activities, the level of creativity related to motivation is 41.2%. In fact, there are only two cases in which level of creativity in evaluation activities is higher than that of the comprehension passages for a given criterion. In the first case (6th grade textbook), the level of evaluation activities' creativity in provoking fluent and flexible thinking is (62.8%) as seen in table (13), while the creativity level is (54.4%) in the comprehension passages, as seen in table (12). In the second case (4th grade textbook), the level of evaluation activities' creativity in provoking fluent and flexible thinking is (47.4%), while it is (43.2%) in the comprehension passages tables (13 & 14) respectively.

Table (12)
Average score and percentage of creativity in text design of comprehension passages for each grade (classification based on appendix 1, p. 129)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creativity Criterion</th>
<th>4th Grade</th>
<th>5th Grade</th>
<th>6th Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>% out of 5</td>
<td>P/F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flexible and fluent thinking (items 1-4) table 6</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originality (11-17) table 7</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation (25-30) table 10</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average score Creativity Level</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table (13)
Average and percentage of creativity level in evaluation activities for each grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creativity criterion</th>
<th>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Grade</th>
<th>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Grade</th>
<th>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average score</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Average score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flexible and fluent thinking (items 5-10) table 8</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>originality in evaluation activities (18-24) table 9</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motivation in evaluation activities (31-36) table 11</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Creativity Level of evaluation activities in Textbooks</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (14)
Levels of creativity in textbook design for each grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of evaluation</th>
<th>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Grade</th>
<th>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Grade</th>
<th>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average score</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Average score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comprehension</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluation activities</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of textbook design</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section Four: Teachers' perspectives of text design creativity level in EFL textbooks for grades (4<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup>)

This section presents teachers' views and their perspectives by using the grounded theory in tabulating the major ideas given by them. Teachers' views are generated from the in-depth interviews for 7 teachers and 2 supervisors who participated in this study, see appendix 4 (p. 149). The aim of the in-depth interview is to set more insight into the results of the content analysis, to explore teachers' suggestions on textbook development, and to explore their views and perceptions of
the textbooks’ creativity level. In the following section, the main themes that emerged from the in-depth interviews are presented.

Statements by each of the nine interviewees were transcribed and sorted under the three creativity areas in question; namely, fluency and flexibility, original thinking and motivation in both comprehension passages and evaluation activities. Statements with similar meaning were then grouped under themes relevant to creativity aspects of textbook samples in comprehension passages and evaluation activities. Actual value of each theme was calculated in accordance with the percentage of its frequency out of the total number of frequencies for all themes (see table 15).

In table (15), 24 theme statements are presented. It appears that 29.12% of teachers’ responses indicate creativity in content design as seen in theme statements (11, 12, 15, 17, 18, 20 and 21). That is, 70.88% of teachers’ responses indicate that there is no creativity in textbook design as characterized by research on creative content design by this researcher. These criteria which achieved high frequency scores are negative criteria, therefore, their high frequency rates are considered to have negative impact on creativity of the text design.

Table (15)
Themes emerging from teachers’ views of textbooks and their value (percentage of responses that come under this theme out of the total number of responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Value %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>overloaded tasks in textbooks prevent teachers and students from focusing on language use</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>There is a very little space for free writing activities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Textbooks don’t encourage search for information</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>There is no emphasis on sentence formation using various forms of sentence structures and styles</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Evaluation exercises in all lessons of all books take the same form and follow the same routine</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>There is no sufficient space for using language skills</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>There is no attention to students’ own creative abilities in language</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>There is no space for or promotion of extra reading activities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Evaluation activities assess students' ability to memorize only</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Comprehension and evaluation activities cover all language skills</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The teachers' guide helps teachers in teaching strategies</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Comprehension lessons can encourage open-mindedness if there were less tasks for the child</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Textbooks don’t encourage resilience for learning in students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>There are no activities that encourage students to initiate projects or learn depending on themselves</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Themes of comprehension passages praise creative people and encourage students to learn about them</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Presentation of evaluation activities doesn’t encourage students to reasoning</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Textbooks give enough opportunity for students to interact</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Comprehension passages' themes are connected to different areas of knowledge</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Variations of language forms and structures are not presented sufficiently in the textbooks</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Almost every lesson focuses on a new grammatical principle</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Although there are specific exercises for sound variations, students don’t have the chance to use their knowledge about sounds</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Paraphrasing ability is developed only through sentence completion or matching activities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>New vocabulary is not reused in the same grade textbook, but is re-mentioned in next grades' textbooks</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Ideas and language structures presented in comprehension passages don’t challenge learners’ knowledge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (16) shows theme statements that indicate 50 positive responses regarding creativity aspects in text design from the perspective of interviewed teachers and "2" supervisors. 60% of these responses indicate that content is motivating, whereas 38% indicate creativity in terms of flexibility and fluency, and 30% indicate that content is creative in terms of originality.
Table (16) shows also that, theme statements 11, 12 and 15 appeared in equal frequency; that is 8 responses out of 50 responses (16%). As theme statement (11) indicates, teachers believe that the teacher guide provides support in teaching techniques. This is considered a bonus quality of the textbook. Teachers argue that the existence of a quality teacher-guide for each textbook increases its potential to be creative. In appendix (4) teacher (D) states “textbook designers didn’t leave teachers without any help. You can’t include every aspect in teaching in the textbook, “How to teach a comprehension passage is in the guide” (p.162). In theme statement (12), the interviewed teachers saw that content of the textbooks encourages open-mindedness in students. Nevertheless, teachers indicated that due to the nature of lesson presentation in textbooks and time limits, they can’t allocate sufficient time in English classes to develop this aspect with their students. Teacher (B) in appendix (4) reflects this idea in that if we have the time to elaborate on the ideas presented in the textbook with kids, then we can help them to be open-minded. But we don’t have time (p. 156). Theme statement (15) reflects teacher’ belief in the contribution of comprehension passages in motivating learners to be creative. Providing so many examples and stories about successful and creative people, according to teachers, encourage students to dream of becoming creative achievers. On the other hand, talking about these stories in textbooks represents social recognition of those creative people. This is another aspect of encouragement for students, according to teachers; because it conveys to them that creativity is socially recognized and rewarded.
Moreover, table (16) shows that theme statements (17 & 18) achieved the next highest value score with 7 positive responses out of 50. Statement (17) indicates teachers’ conviction that textbooks provide opportunity for students’ interaction. This is characterized as a positive and motivational aspect; it also contributes to enhancing students’ abilities to think fluently and flexibly. In appendix (4), Teacher (D) sees that this opportunity is expressed in instructions for “partner-work, partner-question & answer exercises, individual work on crossword games and puzzles, and evaluation of comprehension exercises among others” (p. 161). On the other hand, another area of integration is reflected in theme statement 18, which achieved also the next highest score with 7 positive responses. The statement shows teachers’ appreciation of variety in topics and subjects presented in comprehension passages. This variety means inclusion of themes related to various knowledge areas such as geography (learning about China), history (Ibn Syna), technology (computers, internet or spaceships) and arts (Fairouz). Teachers see that integration of these various areas of knowledge increases students’ abilities to imagine, make connections, dream, accept and respect variety. Some teachers indicated, however, that not all knowledge areas can be integrated to English language learning classes. For example, Teacher C argues that there is no way to design a comprehension passage that integrates other knowledge into the passage, for example mathematics cannot be integrated in this text design (see p. 158).

Table (16) shows as well that theme statements (20 & 21) achieved the lowest value score with 6 positive responses out of 50 responses (12%). Statement (20)
indicates a creative aspect in terms of enhancing fluent and flexible thinking. It expresses teachers’ agreement on textbooks’ provision of new grammatical knowledge in each comprehension lesson. Teachers believe that textbooks provide logical presentation of grammatical principles; this appears in the reliance of each comprehension passage on a new principle that is more advanced than the one before. Teachers see that logical order and continuity in presenting grammar can contribute to students’ learning of grammatical principles. Also, statement (21) indicates creativity in terms of enhancing flexible and fluent thinking. Teachers agree that each lesson provides exercises to evaluate learning of sound variations. Teachers see that these exercises depend on a number of variations for each sound. Presentation of these variations, according to Teacher (G), increases "students’ sensitivity to sounds and their understanding of verbal expressions" (p. 169). However, some teachers argue that even though these exercises provide variation, they don’t provide for actual use or application of these variations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme # in the original</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Creativity criteria (CC)</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The teachers' guide helps teachers in using different teaching strategies</td>
<td>originality</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Comprehension lessons can encourage open-mindedness if there were less tasks for the child</td>
<td>Motivation,</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Themes of comprehension passages praise creative people and encourage students to learn about them</td>
<td>motivation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Textbooks give enough opportunity for students to interact</td>
<td>Motivation, flexibility &amp; fluency</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Comprehension passages' themes are connected to different areas of knowledge</td>
<td>Originality and motivation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Almost every lesson focuses on a new grammatical principle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20</th>
<th>Flexibility &amp; fluency</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Flexibility &amp; fluency</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (17) shows theme statements presenting 149 negative responses regarding creativity aspects in text design from the interviewed teachers’ perspectives. 59.10% of these responses indicate lack of creativity aspects related to enhancing original thinking through the text design, whereas the text design lacks creativity in motivating students to learn English creatively according to 46.31% of the responses. On the other hand, the text design fails to meet creativity criteria related to flexibility and fluency aspects according to 28.86% of the responses.

As shown in table (17), theme statement (1) achieved the highest score value with 15 negative responses (i.e. 10.10% of the negative responses). This theme statement indicates teachers’ belief that any aspect of creativity in the English textbooks is being undermined and restricted by the overloaded materials presented for each of the grades. Teachers argue that the time allocated for English classes throughout the year is not enough to cover all materials required in the textbook. This is the case for all other subject areas. However, the negative effect of this fact on learning English can be more than of that on learning other subjects. “language learning should be creative by definition” says Teacher (I) in appendix (4); “it is a social and interactive subject and should be taught as this, but this is impossible, because textbooks are too overloaded with materials that are put there with no opportunity time wise to connect between them, or to teach students how to connect
between them.” (p.174) Thus, this theme statement shows low creativity level in motivation aspect of text design.

Theme statements (2 & 3) achieved the next highest score value, with 12 responses per each (i.e. 8.05% of the negative responses), as shown in table (17). Statement (2) indicates lack of creativity in terms of developing original thinking in students. Free writing according to teachers is one of the most significant indicators on original thinking in the context of language learning. Therefore, textbooks can’t be contributing to this aspect if activities or exercises that ask or encourage students to practice writing, or even open-ended questions do not exist. Most of the interviewed teachers stated that such type of activities is very rare in the textbooks of the three grades. Similarly, theme statement (3) describes teachers’ view that textbooks lack any aspect of encouraging search for information. The interviewed teachers see also that search for information is a desired feature in learners, if school is supposed to prepare them to be lifelong learners. However, they don’t find English textbooks contributing to this aspect. Teacher (A) in appendix (4) states that “there is no single place in the textbook that encourages search for information” (p152).

Table (17) shows that each theme statement of: 4, 5 & 6 achieved 6.71% of negative responses (10 responses for each out of 149 responses). It shows that theme statements (7, 8 & 9) achieved score value of (6.04%) of the negative responses. Most of these (4 out of 6) theme statements indicate lack of creativity in terms of motivational aspects and fostering original thinking features in learners. These theme
statements indicate that the identical format and similarities across all lessons in each textbook and throughout all textbooks restricts learners’ and teachers’ motivation in the English classes. On the other hand, teachers find time very limiting as compared to the load of the textbook. Thus, time allocated to accomplishing required tasks and theoretical teaching of the language skills is more than that allocated to application or use of language skills, if there was any, according to Teacher B (appendix 4, p. 156). Additionally, as indicated by theme statement (7) the interviewed teachers believe that the design of English textbooks is not sensitive or responsive to learners’ abilities in language learning. Although, language is supposed to be a social and recreational act, the textbooks don’t give enough space for learners to bring their own contributions to the learning process. In theme statement (8), there is additional emphasis on the lack of encouraging for extra reading and elaboration on the learning subjects.

Table (17) shows also that theme statements (13, 14, 16 &19) achieved the low score values as well, with (5.37% of the negative responses per each of the first three and 4.70% for the last one). Theme statements (13, 14 &16) also indicate lack of creative motivational and original aspects in terms of encouraging resilience for learning (statement 13), encouraging self-initiated project and innovation in learning (theme statement 14), encouraging reasoning (statement 16). However, statement (19) indicates lack of creativity in terms of encouraging flexible and fluent thinking. This statement shows the interviewed teachers’ dissatisfaction with presentation of forms and styles of language in the textbooks. Teacher (A) for example, states that students
are not exposed to using different or various sentence structures neither are they asked to use various structures; “They learn that a sentence is a subject-verb-object; if you add any other part they can’t understand it” (appendix 4, p. 149). Moreover, table (17) shows that theme statement (24) achieved the lowest score value with 34% of the negative responses. This statement indicates mainly that teachers don’t find the content or form of comprehension passages and evaluation activities as being challenging and motivating to learners.

**Table 17**

Teachers’ negative responses and their value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative response items</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Creativity Criteria</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>overloaded tasks in textbooks prevent teachers and students from focusing on language use</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>There is a very little space for free writing activities</td>
<td>Originality</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Textbooks don’t encourage search for information</td>
<td>Flexibility and fluency</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>There is no emphasis on sentence formation using various forms of sentence structures and styles</td>
<td>Flexibility and fluency</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Evaluation exercises in all lessons of all books take the same form and follow the same routine</td>
<td>Originality</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>There is no sufficient space for using language skills</td>
<td>Originality and motivation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>There is no attention to students' own creative abilities in language</td>
<td>Originality and motivation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>There is no encouragement for extra reading activities</td>
<td>Motivation and originality</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Evaluation activities assess students' ability to memorize only</td>
<td>Originality, flexibility and fluency</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Textbooks don’t encourage resilience for learning in students</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>There are no activities that encourage students to initiate projects or learn depending on themselves</td>
<td>Motivation and originality</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Presentation of evaluation activities doesn’t encourage students to reasoning</td>
<td>Originality and motivation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Variations of language forms and structures are not presented sufficiently in the textbooks</td>
<td>Flexibility and fluency</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Paraphrasing ability is developed only through sentence completion or matching activities</td>
<td>Originality</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>New vocabulary is not reused in the same grade textbook, but is re-mentioned in next grades' textbooks</td>
<td>Flexibility and fluency and originality</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Ideas and language structures presented in comprehension passages don’t challenge learners'</td>
<td>Originality and motivation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thus, findings in section four reveal the interviewed teachers’ viewpoints regarding the level of creativity in the content design. Table (18) shows teachers positive and negative responses as related to each of the three creativity areas; originality, motivation and flexible and fluent thinking. The table considers numbers of responses that can be related to each of the creativity areas (i.e. if a given response correlates to more than one creativity area, it is counted more than once). Thus, total numbers of responses is 272, as shown in table (18). Results show that motivational aspects achieved the highest positive responses. That is, the interviewed teachers revealed agreement on existence of creativity in motivating learners with 11% of the total responses. However, 25% of the responses regarding creativity in motivational aspects were negative. In terms of originality aspects, only 5.5% of the responses were positive, while 35% of the responses show lack of creativity in originality. In terms of fluent and flexible thinking aspects, around 15% shows negative responses regarding existence of creativity level, while only 6.98% of the responses indicate creativity in this aspect as positive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Creativity Criteria</th>
<th>Positive responses</th>
<th>Negative responses</th>
<th>% of Positive Responses</th>
<th>% of Negative Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Originality</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>5.51%</td>
<td>35.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Flexibility and fluency</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6.98%</td>
<td>15.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>11.03%</td>
<td>25.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>23.57%</td>
<td>76.47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Findings
This section summarizes findings of content analysis and in-depth interviews regarding the level of creativity in comprehension passages and evaluation activities. In terms of content analysis conducted by three raters, the following results are concluded:

- The highest creativity levels in comprehension and evaluation are found in the 6th grade textbook (60.3%).
- The 6th grade textbook achieved criteria of the most creative textbook design.
- The 6th grade textbook highest creativity level is found in contribution of its comprehension passages in motivating learners to learn creatively (68.2%), see table 12.
- The 6th grade textbook lowest creative level is found in its evaluation activities' contribution to encouraging original thinking and ability to synthesize (52.2%), see table 13.
- The least creative textbook design is the 4th grade textbook (46.5%), see table 14.
- The 4th grade textbook highest creativity level (51.4%) is found in its comprehension passages' contribution in provoking original thinking and ability to synthesize in learners, see table 12.
- The 4th grade textbook lowest level is found in its evaluation activities and their creativity in provoking originality and ability to synthesize (37.4%), see table 13.
- The 5th grade textbook also failed creativity criteria in content design in general (50.4%), see table 14.
The 5th grade textbook highest creativity level is found in the contribution of its comprehension passages in motivating learners to learn creatively (62.6%).

The 5th grade textbook lowest creativity level is found in its' evaluation activities’ contribution in provoking original thinking and ability to synthesize (37.6%).

Creativity levels in comprehension passages are higher than those of evaluation activities.

Contribution of comprehension passages in the development of flexible and fluent thinking in learners is low in general, (47.6%).

Contribution of evaluation activities to the development of flexible and fluent thinking in learners is low (55 %).

Contribution of comprehension passages in enhancing original thinking and ability to synthesize is relatively high (57.91%).

Contribution of evaluation activities in the development of original thinking and the ability to synthesize is low (42.4%).

Contribution of comprehension passages in motivating learners to learn creatively is high (61%).

Contribution of evaluation activities in motivating learners to learn creatively is low (53.6%).

In terms of teachers’ viewpoint of the textbooks and their creative level, the following results are formed:
• 23.52% of teachers’ responses indicate creativity in content design as characterized by research on creative content design by this researcher, see table 18.

• 76.48% of teachers’ responses indicate that there is no creativity in textbook design as characterized by research on creative content design, see table 18.

• 60% of teachers’ positive responses express creative motivational aspect of the comprehension passages and evaluation activities, see table 16.

• 38% of teachers’ positive responses express creative criteria in contribution to enhancing flexible and fluent thinking.

• 30% of teachers’ positive responses express creative criteria in originality aspects.

• The most creative aspect in the content design according to the interviewed teachers is motivation with 11% positive responses and 25% negative responses.

• The least creative aspect in the content design according to the interviewed teachers is flexible and fluent thinking with 15% positive responses and 43% negative responses.

In terms of teachers’ conclusion remarks of findings from teachers viewpoint as compared with the raters’ evaluation:

• The findings of the content analysis to the text design by using the creativity scale show discrepancy in creativity levels among textbooks of the three grades. Two of the three textbooks (4th and 5th grades) failed the creativity criteria in
general; there creativity levels were (46.5% & 50.4%) respectively. Whereas, one textbook (6th grade) passed the creativity criteria with (60.3%). These findings are supported by the findings on the interviewed teachers’ perspectives; only 29.12% of their responses represent a positive response in terms of the level of creativity in content design for the textbooks in question.

- Findings of content analysis to the text design by using the creativity scale and teachers’ interviews by using grounded theory show low contribution of textbooks in promoting original thinking and synthesizing abilities. As for creativity in the scale findings, there is low contribution in evaluation activities to this aspect. 4th grade textbook achieved only (37.4%) level of creativity in promoting originality; similarly 5th grade textbook achieved (37.6%) and 6th grade textbook achieved (52.2%). However, these low levels of creativity in promoting originality and ability to synthesize don’t match the findings on the contribution of comprehension passages in these three textbooks to the same aspect. Comprehension passages in the 5th grade achieved (55.4%) and in the 6th grade they achieved (61.8%). The comprehension passages in the 4th grade textbook achieved (49%). Thus, 5 out of 6 of these results show low contribution of textbooks in promoting original thinking and ability to synthesize. Similarly, only (30%) of teachers’ responses were positive in terms of this aspect, versus (60%) negative responses on the contribution of textbooks to original thinking and ability to synthesize in students.
• Findings of content analysis to the text design by using the creativity scale and teachers’ interviews by using the grounded theory show low contribution of textbooks in developing flexible and fluent thinking in learners. In terms of the content analysis using the creativity scale, findings show that contribution of both comprehension passages and evaluation activities to this aspect are low (47.6% & 55%) respectively. In terms of comprehension passages, the 4th grade textbook achieved (43.2%), 5th grade textbook achieved (45.2%) and 6th grade textbook achieved (54.4%). In terms of evaluation activities, 4th grade textbook achieved (47.4%), 5th grade textbook achieved (54.8%) and 6th grade textbook achieved (62.8%). Thus, out of 6 results only one passed the creativity criteria in promoting flexible and fluent thinking. In fact, these findings go along with the findings on teachers’ perspectives, where (15%) only of the teachers’ responses were positive in terms of the contribution of textbooks to the development of flexible and fluent thinking in learners.

• Findings of content analysis to the text by using the creativity scale and teachers’ interviews by using the grounded theory show significant contribution of textbooks in motivating learners to learn EFL. According to the findings of the content analysis, the highest levels of creativity in two (5th & 6th grades) of the three textbooks in question are in aspects related to their contribution to learners’ motivation. Most of these creative aspects are found in comprehension passages not in evaluation activities. The evaluation activities achieved low levels in terms of promoting flexible and fluent thinking (47.2%, 41.2% and 61.8%) for the three
grade textbooks respectively. In terms of comprehension passages, the 4th, 5th and 6th grade textbooks achieved (52.4%, 62.6% and 68.2%) respectively. The significance of textbooks’ contribution to learners’ motivation is indicated also in the findings of interviews with teachers. 60% of teachers’ responses regarding this aspect were positive. Furthermore, findings of teachers’ interviews show that motivation is the most creative aspect in the textbooks’ content design.

**General Findings**

The first finding: The highest creativity level in the design of instructional material in both comprehension and evaluation is achieved by the unit samples of 6th grade textbook (60.3%). As to the motivation to learn creatively it was found that the level on average is (68.2%). Nevertheless, the text design of evaluation activities failed in meeting the standard of originality in the text of grade 6.

The second finding: The lowest creativity level in text design (be it at the comprehension and/or the evaluation) is found to be in the fourth grade text book sample units. The general level of creativity in 4th grade textbook is (46.5%) on the comprehension and evaluation design. The text design of fourth grade does not meet the creativity criteria of set in the creativity scale: Its creativity level (51.4%) is found in its comprehension passages' contribution in propelling original thinking and ability to synthesize in learners. However, the level of its evaluation activities' creativity in provoking originality and ability to synthesize is the lowest (37.4%).
The third finding: Figures indicate that fifth grade text also failed to meet the criteria of creativity in text design at both sides of both text comprehension and evaluation (50.4%). Yet the 5th grade text passed creativity level needed for motivating the learner to learn creatively (62.6%) for comprehension, but failed to motivate the learner by the design of the evaluation sections in the 5th grade text sample.

The fourth finding: textbook design from teachers’ viewpoint as seen in the in-depth interviews is very low in creativity, see table (18). The teachers’ responses as tabulated in theme statements (grounded theory) show that 76.47% of these statements are negative. Most negative responses are on originality level of creativity in text design (35.3%).

1). Content design of instructional material (Comprehension & Evaluation)

In general the research answer to the study first question is that creativity in text book design is at best in the sixth grade text (60.3%) which is a passing level. But yet it lacks originality at the motivation level in all grades. The fourth and fifth grade text design is poor in general; it failed the criterion of originality in its questions given in the evaluation section. This general finding is from the three raters view points. Findings show very low creative levels in English textbooks in terms of their contribution to fluent and flexible thinking development. In fact all samples of comprehension passages failed this criterion of creative content design. Only one sample passed the English creativity criteria in promoting flexible and fluent thinking. The evaluation activities achieved low levels in terms of promoting flexible and
fluent thinking (47.2%, 41.2% and 61.8%) for the three textbooks respectively. Findings of the content analysis by using the creativity scale show that contribution of comprehension passages in provoking original thinking and ability to synthesize is relatively high with 60.4% average of all examined samples. Examined comprehension passages in the textbook of the 5th grade achieved (61.4%) and those in the 6th grade they achieved (66.8%). The only failure in this aspect is the examined comprehension passages in the 4th grade textbook (52.6%). Findings of this research show low contribution of evaluation activities in textbooks in promoting original thinking and ability to synthesize. In case of the three textbooks under question (textbooks of 4th, 5th and 6th grades) the lowest creativity levels are found in the evaluation activities' contribution to provoking original thinking and ability to synthesize with 37.4%, 37.6% and 52.2% respectively; all of the textbook samples fail this criterion. This is supported by interviewed teachers' responses; only 30% of the responses on this aspect were positive.

2) Motivation to learn creatively (as in Comprehension & Evaluation activities)

As to the second question evaluation of creativity from teachers view point given in the interview results show that 76.48% of teachers’ responses indicate that there is no creativity in textbook design as characterized by research on creative content design by this researcher. 11.03% of teachers’ responses regarding textbooks’ contribution to learners’ motivation were positive. Furthermore, findings of teachers’ interviews show that motivation is the most creative aspect in the textbooks’ content design. But only (15%) of the teachers’ responses were positive in terms of the
textbooks' contribution to the development of flexible and fluent thinking in learners. Findings of the interviews with teachers show also that they conceive comprehension passages as not creative in originality aspects; only 30% of the responses on this aspect were positive.

3) Level of agreement between findings of evaluation by using the creativity scale and teachers' viewpoints by using the grounded theory

In counting the failure aspects in tables (12 & 13) one can find that 13 out of 18 measured aspects in all texts of 4-6th grades failed (i.e. 72.22%). The teachers’ views are more negative in their evaluation as compared to the scale (76.47%), see table (18). This shows that there is an agreement between the results of evaluation by using the creativity scale and teachers’ views by using the grounded theory with (4.25%) points to the advantage of the text design as measured by the scale. However, any difference which is less than 5% might be attributed to occurrence by chance (i.e. the difference is insignificant). Thus, one can say easily that the result is triangulated in agreement from the three sources of the collected data (i.e. the researcher, expert and teachers).
Chapter Five

Discussion and Recommendations

This chapter discusses findings on the evaluation of Palestinian English textbooks (4th-6th grades) and the creativity level of their content design. These findings were presented in Chapter Four in relation to three data sources: 1) Data generated from content analysis by this researcher (R1) and by one TEFL supervisor (R2); 2) Data generated from content analysis by a focus group of 7 English language teachers (R3); and 3) Data generated from in-depth interviews with the 7 teachers, and 2 English supervisors. These findings are discussed herein in light of the reviewed literature and previous studies.

Moreover, this chapter presents the recommendations based on these findings. Recommendations include aspects related to further educational research, curriculum development, and TEFL practices in terms of utilizing and enriching textbooks.

Findings show that most of the textbook samples failed to achieve the specified creativity levels. The only successful textbook is that of the sixth grade; it achieved creativity in designing comprehension passages only, not in evaluation activities design. Whereas, the textbooks of the 4th and 5th grades failed the criteria of creative content design of both comprehension passages and evaluation activities (refer to table 14).
Most of the textbook samples failed also to achieve the desired criteria of creativity in content design as defined by this researcher. As mentioned before, the comprehension passages and evaluation activities of each textbook are examined according to three criteria of creativity in content design; namely, flexible and fluent thinking, original thinking, and motivation. In terms of comprehension passages, both textbooks of the 5th and 6th grade achieved two successful creativity criteria out of three; original thinking and motivation, and failed to achieve creativity in flexible and fluent thinking. On the other hand, the textbook of the 4th grade failed to achieve all of the three criteria. In terms of evaluation activities, only one textbook (6th grade) achieved two successful criteria out of three; these successful criteria are flexible and fluent thinking. Textbooks of the 4th and 5th grades failed to achieve all of the three criteria in evaluation activities.

In the following sections, findings are interpreted and discussed in light of the reviewed literature.

**Flexible and Fluent Thinking in Comprehension Passages**

Findings show very low creative levels in English textbooks in terms of their contribution to fluent and flexible thinking development. In fact all samples of comprehension passages failed this criterion of creative text design. Literature shows that flexibility and fluency in comprehension passages is related to a number of factors, mainly; variability in presenting language styles and sentence structure styles, systematic approach to emphasize and elaborate on the inventory of vocabulary for
learners, and utilizing introductory activities to stimulate different learning strategies in learners (Chaiklen, 2002; Lee, 2009; & Wells, 1999). The findings of this research are in agreement with (Fattash, 2010; & Hamdouna, 2007) in the sense that flexibility and fluency in comprehension are not fully considered in designing comprehension passages for the EFL textbooks in question.

Individuals can be trained on flexible and fluent thinking. This presumes that these processes in thinking are "domain specific and learned", (Stokes, 2001, p. 279). Therefore, it is legitimate to expect that textbook of each subject matter aims for these domain specific and learned flexible and fluent thinking processes. That is, textbooks (especially EFL textbooks) should provide sets of texts that provoke strategies of thinking relevant to the subject matter in question on one hand, and encourage switching between correct strategies on the other.

Flexible and Fluent Thinking in Evaluation Activities

According to the findings of this research, only one sample (Sample 9, Unit 22 from the 6th textbook) passed the English creativity criteria in promoting flexible and fluent thinking. The evaluation activities achieved low levels in terms of promoting flexible and fluent thinking (47.2%, 41.2% and 61.8%) for the three textbooks respectively. In fact, these findings go along with the findings on teachers’ perspectives, where (6.98%) only of the teachers’ responses were positive in terms of the textbooks' contribution to the development of flexible and fluent thinking in learners.
These findings are in agreement with the findings of previous literature. Fattash (2010) and Hamdouna (2007) find that textbooks in their current design of evaluation activities don’t provide a balanced focus on different aspects of language skills and areas of learning. This lack of balance is also apparent in the distribution on levels of difficulty for the same type of task. Textbook evaluation activities should provide variety of tasks for each student level. This is imperative in developing flexible and fluent thinking. One task (in a lesson) that addresses low achieving students is not sufficient in developing their thinking strategies; this applies for medium achieving or gifted students, too. Literature shows that textbooks should not only consider differences between individuals on the same task, but also differences between tasks for the same individual, (Erriccson, 1996; & Stokes, 2001).

In fact, providing variety of tasks for each student level allows the use of the "exposure strategy" in classes. This strategy is tested in various sets of research, including biological, technological, social, behavioral and cognitive related studies. The exposure strategy means that the more individuals are exposed to, introduced to and trained on procedures, tasks or requirements, the more likely they are to master them. The more they master these procedures and requirements, the more likely they are to master the resulting thinking strategies that stem from them being involved in the process, (Stokes, 2001).
Original Thinking in Comprehension Passages

Findings of the content analysis for text design show that contribution of comprehension passages in provoking original thinking and ability to synthesize is relatively high with 60.4% average of all examined samples. Examined comprehension passages in the textbook of the 5th grade achieved (61.4%) and those in the 6th grade they achieved (66.8%). The only failure in this aspect is the evaluated comprehension passages in the 4th grade textbook sample (52.6%). However, findings of the interviews with teachers show that they conceive comprehension passages as not creative in this sense.

In fact, the reviewed previous studies and literature don’t support the finding that comprehension passages are creative in terms of promoting originality and ability to synthesize in learners. Alfaqawi (2010) and Hamdouna (2007) for instance, argue that the least existing factors of originality in the Palestinian English textbooks are encouraging extra reading. This is one of the aspects that comprehension should contribute to. The English textbooks present information in a very plain manner that their text content design doesn’t encourage seeking further knowledge about the subject. Nevertheless, this discrepancy in findings between this study and previous studies may be related to the fact that when originality aspects are investigated, the focus would be directed to the evaluation activities more than to comprehension passages themselves.
Original Thinking in Evaluation Activities

Findings of this research show low contribution of evaluation activities in textbooks in promoting original thinking and ability to synthesize. In the case of the three textbooks under question (textbooks of 4th, 5th and 6th grades) the lowest creativity levels are found in the evaluation activities and their contribution to provoking original thinking and ability to synthesize with 37.4%, 37.6% and 52.2% respectively; all of the textbook samples fail this criterion. This is supported by interviewed teachers' responses; only 30% of the responses on this aspect were positive.

These findings are in agreement with previous studies and literature. Fattash (2010) and Hamdouna (2007) find that textbooks of English don’t encourage nor attempt to develop learners’ abilities in independent writing. Findings of this research are similar to those of these studies which found that textbooks don’t encourage inferring and making generalizations, self expression or defending ideas which are factors that develop originality and the ability to synthesize in learners.

There are no free writing tasks given in the evaluation activities in the examined textbook samples. These activities don’t ask for search for information, extra reading, argumentation or debating, and these activities don’t ask for self-initiated projects or ideas. Originality is a matter of producing learners who are able of initiating the process of continuous learning and development of new innovative
thinking strategies. This kind of innovation can be developed gradually but systematically through the learning tasks provided in the evaluation activities.

**Motivation in Comprehension Passages**

Motivation aspect passed the creativity scale at level of 61% as seen in table (10). However, it achieved only 11.03% of teachers' positive responses on all aspects (table 18), and 36.39% of all responses on motivation (table 18). This means that motivation in text design failed the creativity criteria from the teachers' viewpoint.

The reviewed previous studies and literature agree with these findings. Musleh (2010) indicates that Palestinian English textbooks provide for motivation in the comprehension passages, but not in agreement with teachers' views. These passages provide knowledge about the target language speakers and their culture. However, there is a need to ensure that motivation elements integrate meaningful involvement in cultural aspects. English is becoming part of learners' everyday life; they find it in the food labels, shop signs, T.V. shows, games, internet, books and magazines and many other places. Musleh (2010) who did her study for University of Barcelona states that English has not become part of everyday life for the Catalanian people as it has become for the Palestinians. Literature reviewed above shows that learners' interest, in knowing about the culture of foreign language speakers, is one of the most important factors in motivating them to learn the language. I agree with Musleh's argument about the significance of motivation. It is suffice to know that within the Palestinian context, this argument is most relevant. This is the case because
many international supporters (from different nationalities) come to live with Palestinians to express solidarity and speak English; Palestinian students' interest in knowing about the foreign cultures increases, hence, increasing their motivation to learn English. Unfortunately, the text design for EFL textbooks fails to have the motivation aspect as measured by the creativity scale.

**Motivation in Evaluation Activities**

Findings show that contribution of evaluation activities in motivating learners to learn creatively is low (53.6%). As mentioned earlier in the review of the previous studies, learners' perception of themselves and their competences, and their view of the others' perception of them and their competences are very important factors in fostering motivation to EFL. Their awareness of the need to learn EFL and their interest in it are factors that contribute to motivation, as well. According to the findings of this research, the design of the evaluation activities doesn’t allow developing these aspects, as well. This conclusion is in agreement with the findings of other previous studies such as (Aqel 2009; Fattash, 2010; & Hamdouna, 2007). According to the findings of this research, the textbooks’ most creative aspect is related motivation. However, Most of this contribution is found in comprehension passages not in evaluation activities. Evaluation activities of the fourth and fifth grade textbooks failed the criteria of motivation in evaluation activities (47.2% & 41.2% consecutively), while the sixth grade textbook achieved 61.8% in this aspect. The
findings show also that the general contribution of evaluation activities in motivating learners to learn creatively in the whole sample is low (53.6%).

In reviewing the examined evaluation activities we find them lacking motivational aspects in two ways. On the one hand, the current evaluation activities develop the sense of learned helplessness by asking learners to achieve tasks that they can't carry out on their own, without providing meaningful and helpful guidance and instructions. On the other hand, evaluation activities, even though providing difficult levels of tasks, do not provide challenging but promising and rewarding tasks. That is, learners need to feel the sense of achieving tasks that are described as hard, they need to reinforce their self-worth feelings by achieving tasks that distinguish them and their competences, but at the same time that don’t make them feel they can't complete their desired learning outcomes. For example, table 11 in Chapter 4, shows that the level of evaluation activities' contribution to encouraging creative acts is very low (38.6%) only. It shows also that the evaluation activities don’t contribute much towards encouraging reasoning (53.6%). The recommendations at the end of this section will provide some suggestions on creative motivational aspects for evaluation activities and comprehension passages.

**Conclusion**

Reading is considered as one major skill in learning languages, especially learning a foreign language. The aim of reading is not only ensuring recognition of letters, sounds, words, and phrases. What is of a great significance for language
learners is the ability to comprehend a given text in the language in question. It is only when learners can comprehend and understand what is written or spoken in this language, that they believe they are learning the language. Recognition of words or phrases shouldn't be the focus of teaching English or any other language as a foreign language. It is very important not to treat reading skill strategies as something different than comprehension strategies. Therefore, instruction and curriculum designers should be aware of this relationship and of the aim of reading and comprehension lessons when they design (or choose) a text and when they design (or choose) a set of evaluation activities.

In terms of designing or choosing a text for comprehension lessons, educators and curriculum designers should bare in mind that learners (even though they are young children) of a foreign language need to be introduced to more than one type, style, form, genre, structure… of language. Learners use language in their daily life as one entity, and not a collection of entities separated from each other easily. Comprehension text design should be approached in a holistic rather than reductionist manner. A comprehension passage should be authentic. In real life we can't find an original piece of language that contains only simple sentence structure, or that contains only a sequence of sentences that are not linked to each other. Therefore, in a foreign language learning setting we should not provide such a passage.

Learning comprehension is not concerned with the ability of learners to read fluently as stated before; it is rather simply about to what extent learners comprehend
what they read. In addition to the teaching activities in teaching reading, comprehension evaluation activities take an important role in detecting whether learners really comprehend the passage. It is important to realize that even native speakers of any language may face difficulties in comprehending a passage in that language. Therefore, in a foreign language learning setting, comprehension evaluation is a very crucial and valuable part. It is through these evaluation activities that teachers can assess the needs of their students in terms of developing reading and comprehension skills.

Comprehension evaluation activities are also of great significance to the learners themselves. Evaluation of comprehension should provide a sense of motivation to learners; in addition, it should provide them with the needed assistance in better understanding and comprehending the passage. Comprehension evaluation is a tool of assessment and development measure (not only for teachers) but also for learners. It is very important that instruction and curriculum designers, educators and parents have an approach to learning that values and respects learners' self-assessment. Learners' self-assessment could be more informing and enlightening in terms of understanding what learners need to improve. Therefore, comprehension evaluation design should take into consideration the learners' role in assessing their comprehension levels and needs. Learners need to know for themselves the source of problem in their comprehension of a text; is it about understanding single word meanings? Is it about understanding phrases? Is it about understanding ideas,
relationships, or order…? Then, this determines their learning strategies to solve the problem.

**Recommendations**

This section provides some suggestions and recommendations for curriculum developers in order to increase creativity levels of English textbooks in terms of flexibility and fluency, originality and motivation. These recommendations are presented in light of the literature review, findings of content analysis of the textbooks and interviews with teachers.

I would like first to state two important recommendations in light of the results of this study and the reviewed previous studies. As presented in Chapter Two, a considerable body of research on evaluation of the Palestinian textbooks found that the textbooks lack quality in their content design. These studies have followed various methodologies, targeted various populations and addressed the content of the textbooks from various perspectives; and yet, the results were all in agreement with each other; the textbooks do not conform to the required standards in curriculum design. Therefore, educational policy makers are invited to make use of research findings on text design of EFL textbooks. The Ministry of Educations conducts annual review of the textbooks, but the resulting modifications are focused on typing errors, numbers of lessons in most of the cases, as some teachers argue. Masters degree students are also invited to use the scale to evaluate other subject textbooks. Masters degree students could conduct studies that investigate or explore the MoE's
policy in curriculum development, and to see whether it is research-oriented or not. Researchers are invited to review the bases for curriculum development.

**Recommendations related to the content design of comprehension passages**

**Improving flexibility and fluency**: As mentioned above, there is a need for variability to enhance flexibility and fluency in textbooks. The following provisions can contribute in developing a set of strategies to understand English that can be options for variability: a) diverse language styles, including different sentence structures, narrative modes, genres and/or different types of composition; b) presenting new words in their various forms, such as words in noun form, adjective and/or verb from... etc; c) systematic use of the developing inventory of vocabulary for learners in different contexts, through reusing the set of new words in proceeding lessons and activities in different forms and sentence structures; and d) presenting warm up or introductory activities that can provide variability, motivation and are based on learners’ prior knowledge and experiences. For example, using popular games that remind students of their early childhood, relating lesson titles to daily events and activities of learners, starting lessons with a question or discussion on a photo, reminding of previous lessons and connecting them to the new title... etc.

The sample texts extracted from the 5th grade textbook, for example, have a good base that can be developed in terms of flexibility and fluency aspects. The text in unit 14 of the textbook, entitled “Fairouz”, allows teachers to vary in the language styles; it can be taught as a story or as an autobiography for example. However, the
whole text depends only on one structure form of sentences; “she wanted to listen… they didn’t have a radio… the teachers heard her singing… she still sings”… etc. The text uses the same language structure; hence, variation in language structure suffices to improvement.

The passage says:

“The teachers at Nihad’s school heard her sing. She sang more beautifully than a bird. One day she sang on the radio. A new star was born”, (fifth grade English Student Book, p. 58).

One suggestion is that this passage could be transformed into:

“As Nihad sang, her teachers listened. Her voice was more beautiful than a bird’s. When she sang on the radio, they knew that a new star was born”.

The new suggested change includes simple and compound structures of sentences which allow more flexibility and fluency in language forms.

**Fostering originality and ability to synthesize:** curriculum developers may consider the content it self and the presentation of the content of these passages. The content should be more of a realistic and interesting nature. Designers of curriculum may think of including diverse authentic and meaningful texts, for example, road instruction texts, tourists’ guidance texts, student guidance texts, mail exchange texts, travel stories, historical texts, possible conversational texts, different life styles and
cultures… etc. Presentation of the content can be a strong factor in provoking originality. Comprehension passages may for instance include open-ends, inviting learners to imagine possibilities of closure; poetry lines, encouraging various interpretations of meaning or relevance to the passage; dialogue structure; or presenting the content in a type of a game or a riddle… etc.

The Palestinian English textbooks in general are based on a fictitious interaction between a Palestinian child and a British friend. This can be used in building many conversational and interactive passages, where students can role-play the conversations. For example, in Unit 6 of the fifth grade textbook, entitled “A Head Full of Ideas” in appendix 9 (p. 229), the whole passage is formed of a series of sentences that present information about Ibn Sina. The story of Ibn Sina and his distinguished achievements would have been way more attractive and more interesting to students if it wasn’t limited to the mere presentation of a set of information. The story could be presented through a dialogue between the Palestinian and British friends in light of their interest in the history of Muslim people. Replacing the piece of information that Ibn Sina “loved to read and write” the two friends would talk about the things Ibn Sina wrote about or was interested in. Instead of telling the readers that he “taught himself many things” the dialogue would include examples of how he learned so many things and what the things he taught to himself. This will provide learners with an original and authentic story that would encourage them to learn more about Ibn Sina, make him a role-model for them, and help them benefit from the story of his success.
**Improving motivation:** Motivation can be enhanced in the content of comprehension passages. The content should include more examples of success stories, people achieving despite hard circumstances, people with disabilities taking the lead in the world… etc. In addition, the content of comprehension passages should be challenging in a way that provokes learners' resilience; it shouldn’t be only a group of simple structure sentences that are put together; rather, the structure of the comprehension passage itself should be motivating learners to interpret the meaning and make sense of the sequence. It should be challenging also in the sense of encouraging learners' reasoning; through providing conflicting but meaningful situations where learners need to compare, examine and evaluate ideas.

In Unit 6 of the fourth grade textbook, in appendix 9, (p. 204), the lesson constitutes a photograph of a bicycle shop and the following text:

“Mr. White has a bicycle shop. His shop is in Manchester. He sells bicycles every day. Last week he sold twenty-six bicycles. He sold a red bicycle on Friday”.

It is common known that boys and girls at age of 10 (fourth grade) like bicycles and they find them an interesting thing to talk about and to ride and play with. Therefore, the topic or the theme of this lesson is interesting for them. However, the content of the lesson doesn’t encourage them at all to use their enthusiasm about bicycles in learning of language. The lesson would have been more motivating to them if it was a narration by a Palestinian child on how he/ she and his/ her friends in the neighborhood enjoy their free time riding bicycles. This would motivate students
to talk about their own experience, what bicycle colors they like, who bought their bicycles for them, with whom they ride… etc. This would be more motivating for a ten years old child than knowing about a shop owned by a British man, and more interesting than knowing how many bicycles he sells every day.

**Recommendations related to the content design of comprehension evaluation activities**

**Improving self reflection abilities:** comprehension evaluation activities should help learners to ask themselves questions about what they read and about their understanding of it, and to write down their thoughts. As mentioned before, comprehension evaluation should serve as a self-assessment tool for the learners. Evaluation activities should encourage learners to monitor what they have missed (in terms of ideas, word meanings, linking words…). Then, these activities should encourage learners to reread and reassess. Such acts will improve their resilience to learn even in a challenging learning environment.

**Improving learners' motivation:** comprehension evaluation activities should contribute to the learners' motivation in terms of foreign language reading and in terms of comprehension improvement. This can be achieved through developing evaluation activities that encourage (or even systemize) group discussions on the reading texts. Group discussion provides support to individuals in several ways: it helps them understand specific parts or aspects that they find difficult to understand, it creates collective connection to the text, brings collective memories of students
about the topic, refreshes individual memories, and comforts learners who feel confused and worried about their belief that they are not able to understand the text. Comprehension evaluation activities can foster motivation also through encouraging extra reading. For example, through the evaluation activities learners can be asked to read more about a person mentioned in the text, the author of the text, the places mentioned, or about other related aspects, and then present (verbally or in writing) some new information to the group. Extra reading helps learners to broaden their background knowledge and inventory of meanings and vocabulary.

Seeking creative motivational aspects in evaluation activities, curriculum designers and educators may consider a group of important aspects such as: a). incorporation of tasks that encourage search for knowledge (looking up the life of an author of a comprehension passage); b). encouraging thinking about knowledge and comparing all knowledge aspects (comparing life in a direst to life on a river's bank, for instance); c). encouraging purposeful open-minded thinking (tasks based on imaginary situations, for example asking boys to imagine they are girls and vise versa to promote justice attitudes); d). encouraging home work and assignments that allow integrating one's own interests (choosing from multiple options in preparing a homework, writing an essay or one paragraph about your favorite T.V show); e). suggesting extra curricula activities (asking students to draw the place described in the comprehension passage and make a contest); and g). encouraging integration of other subject matters in learning English (for example, if the passage is about
mammals, one evaluation activity could be about referring to the Science textbook to find other examples of mammals).

**Improving ability to summarize:** to improve the learners’ ability to comprehend this research recommends that; the text should include requiring the student to summarize what he had learned in the comprehension passage. Never the less the ability to summarize has to be developed gradually. Evaluation activities may start with asking learners to collectively or (peer-to-peer) say what they think are the important things in the comprehension passage. Evaluation activities may include ordering activities, retelling activities (in students' own words), rephrasing, and providing one sentence summaries of the main ideas in a paragraph.

**Improving imaginative skills:** Comprehension evaluation activities should help the learners to visualize the texts. Learners should be encouraged to create pictures of characters, people, places or actions and events mentioned in the reading passage. For example, one evaluation activity could be an open-ended question asking learners to write a paragraph that describes the setting (place, more particularly) or a person that the comprehension passage is talking about. It is important to make it clear that this evaluation activity encourages learners to describe things from their own perspective depending on the information given in the passage. Nevertheless, teachers can contribute to developing these imaginative skills during the reading activity itself. This can be achieved through encouraging learners to read slowly and thoughtfully, using periods and paragraph endings, imposing some
questions during reading, asking learners to share what they are imagining while reading, encouraging learners to draw pictures of their images… etc.

**Connection to prior knowledge:** Comprehension evaluation activities should help learners to connect new information to content they already know or have learned gradually and logically. For example, one evaluation activity could be drawing mind maps for ideas mentioned in the comprehension lesson, a web of keywords of concepts introduced in the passages or thematic grouping of objects or characters. It is important to link these maps or webs of words or concepts to what they remind learners of.
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